#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 637

95

CE 005 503

Webb. Robert I.: And Others AUTHOR TITLE

Conceptual Framework for Conducting Cost Benefit

Studies in Wisconsin VTAE and Cost Benefit

Studies -- VTAE Programs.

District 1 Technical Inst., Eau Claire, Wis. INSTITUTION

Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education SPONS AGENCY (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Wisconsin State Board of

Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, Madison.e

PUB DATE

162p.; The first two pages of Appendix 2 may NOTE

reproduce poorly

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$8.24 Plus Postage

\*Agribusiness: Agricultural Machinery; \*Cost DESCRIPTORS

> Effectiveness: Economic Factors: Followup Studies; \*Program Costs: \*Program Effectiveness: Salesmanship;

\*Vocational Education

#### ABSTRACT

The step-by-step cost benefit study, confined to measuring and comparing economic costs with economic benefits, is based on the 1971, 1972, and 1973 classes graduating from the Agribusiness-Machinery Partsman-Salesman Program at District One Technical Institute in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. Numerous tables throughout the report contain cost benefit data. Private Economic Costs, Chapter 1, are reflected in a general formula calculating the components of student opportunity cost, other school related expenses, percentage of students receiving financial aid in agribusiness, and the average amount of financial aid received by students in the agribusiness program. The model implies that a student would work or go to vocational school and does not consider the alternative of college. Chapter 2, Societal Economic Cost, identifies 16 components for computation: instructional costs (teachers), student opportunity costs, average financial aid given, equipment depreciation, building depreciation, ancillary and professional, administration local, debt service, ... operation/maintenance, transportation, fixed charges, transfers to clearing accounts, outgoing transfers accounts, school sales, food services, and school administration. Societal/private economic benefits are determined in Chapter 3; the concluding chapter determines societal/private henefit cost ratios. Two appendixes contain tabulations of material related to private/societal economic costs. (EA)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished

\* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort

\* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal

\* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality

\* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not

st responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions st

\* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* FINAL REPORT

U S OEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EOUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EOUCATION

THIS OOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPROOUCEO EXACTLY AS RECEIVEO FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-

THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATEO OO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EOUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Project No. 19-028-151-224

and

Project No. 19-029-151-224

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CONDUCTING
COST BENEFIT STUDIES IN WISCONSIN VTAE

and

COST BENEFIT STUDIES - VTAE PROGRAMS

Robert Webb Research Assistant

Wayne R. Atkins
Assistan: Director for Research and Planning

Norbert K. Wurtzel District Director

District One Technical Institute Eau Claire, Wisconsin

July, 1974

The project was funded pursuant to a grant with the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, thru use of federal funds from the U.S. Office of Education and by matching funds provided by the District One Technical Institute. The views or opinions stated in this report are those representing the professional judgment of the investigators and do not necessarily reflect the views of the participating agencies.

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

3

SO

i

#### FOREWORD

This paper is intended to contribute to the objectives as set forth in project no. 19-028-151-224, Conceptual Framework for Conducting Cost Benefit Studies in Wisconsin VTAE, and at the same time to apply those concepts to an actual cost benefit study on an existing program in VTAE District One as stipulated in project no. 19-029-151-224, Cost Benefit Studies - VTAE Programs.

For the purpose of developing this framework and conducting this study, the research and planning office of District One obtained the services of Mr. Robert Webb, who was a graduate of the School of Business, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, class of May, 1974. Mr. Webb's qualifications in terms of conducting such a study are manifested by several accomplishments on his part. These accomplishments are:

- 1. He was the top graduate in his class in the School of Business.
- 2. At the time of graduation he was probably the first student in the history of that school to have completed majors in accounting, finance, and business administration.
- 3. During his senior year he received acceptance directly into doctoral studies at the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Northwestern University, and the University of Pennsylvania—Wharton School of Finance and Commerce; into graduate work with the option of entering doctoral studies at Stanford University; and was a finalist for admission to doctoral studies at Harvard University School of Business.

In reviewing this study, the reader should bear in mind that the rather complete absence of follow-up studies indicating initial earnings and average hours worked on the part of high school graduates in this part of Wisconsin, made it virtually impossible to draw accurate comparisons between the students in the District One Agri-Business Program and the control group as those



ii

comparisons would relate to this data. Since this information was not available the author substituted corresponding data which was available on a national basis. Although this substitution detracts somewhat from the credibility of the specific ratios obtained, in terms of methodology it does emphasize the need for developing a system of follow-up whereby this data would become available.

Other hypotheses from which various derlators were used are set forth most vividly by the author. Again, the matter of which of these deflators, if any, should be applied will be left to those who will ultimately make the decision as to the precise model to be used in conducting cost benefit studies in the VTAE System.

In any event, all of us who are involved with the development of a cost benefit model for the VTAE System in Wisconsin, should find the effort and expertise which Mr. Webb has devoted to this study to be of invaluable assistance.



# DISTRICT ONE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE - EAU CLAIRE

620 WEST CLAIREMONT AVENUE FAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN 54701

July 10, 1974

Mr. Wayne R. Atkins
Assistant Director for
Research and Planning
District One Technical Institute
620 West Clairemont Avenue
Eau Claire, WI 54701

Dear Mr. Atking:

Attached is the cost-benefit study that I conducted on the Machinery Partsman-Salesman Program which is an associate degree program offered at District One Technical Institute. This draft is for your review and criticism only; it is not intended to be a final report.

The report that follows explains the steps I went through to arrive at the objective; the determination of societal and private economic benefit/cost ratios. I have attampted to explain the effects of different assumptions, presented arguments for and against the adoption of certain key procedures and assumptions, and have taken the liberty to make recommendations.

Throughout this study, I have endeavored to avoid computational errors, however, such errors inevitably slip into the data accumulation process.

Cordially,

Robert I. Webb

I. Webb.

jе



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	RD

Introduction
Chapter One - Private Economic Costs
Chapter Two - Societal Economic Costs
Chapter Three - Private and Societal Economic Benefits 60
Chapter Four - Societal and Private Benefit Cost Ratios 81
List of Tables
Table 1 - Average Financial Aid Received by Semester for Agri-Business Graduates by Graduating Classes for 1971, 1972, 1973 11
Table 2A - Schedule Converting Calendar Year Mean Income in Current Dollars of Males 18-24 Attaining 4 Years of High School Education Only to Academic Year Income for the Years 1969-1972
Table 2B - Schedule Converting Calendar Year Mean Income in Current Dollars of Male of Year Round Full-Time Worker Age 18-24 Attaining 4 Years of High School Education Only to Academic Year Mean Income for the Years 1969-1972
Table 3A - Schedule of Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs of Agri- Business Program Enrollees Using Mean Income, in Current Dollars, of Males Age 18-24 Attaining 4 Years of High School Only for the Academic Years 1969-1972
Table 3B - Schedule of Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs of Agri-Business
Program Enrollees Using Mean Income, in Current Dollars, of Male Year Round, Full-Time Workers Age 18-24 Attaining 4 Years of High School Only for the Academic Years 1969-1972 14
Table 4 - Labor Force Status in Summer of 1969 of White Males 18-21 Enrolled in School in October 1969
Table 5 - Unadjusted and Adjusted Student Opportunity Costs per Enrollee by Semester for the Academic Years 1969-1972 16
Table 6 - Employment Status of High School Graduates Not Enrolled in College and of School Dropouts as of October of Year of Graduation or Dropout, by Sex, Marital Status of Women, and Color, 1959-72
Table 7A - Schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for Classes Graduating in 1971-73
Graduating in 1971-73



Table	7B		Schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for Classes Graduating in 1971-73	-	20
Table	7C	-	Schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for Classes Graduating in 1971-73	•	21
Table	7D	-	Schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for Classes Graduating in 1971-73	•	22
Table	8A	-	Instructional Costs by Semester Rank for Agri-Business Program Enrollees for the Years 1969-1973	-	23
Table	8в	-	Showing Agri-Business Enrollment by Semester Rank for the Years 1969-1973	•	24
Table	9 <b>A</b>	-	Student Opportunity Costs Adjusted for the Time Value of Money for Agri-Business Program Enrollees, by Semester for the Years 1969-1973	•	29
Table	9В	-	Student Opportunity Costs Adjusted for the Time Value of Money for Agri-Business Program Enrollees by Semester for the Years 1969-1973	•	30
Table	9C	-	Student Opportunity Costs Adjusted for the Time Value of Money for Agri-Business Program Enrollees, by Semester for the Years 1969-1973	•	31
Table	9D	-	Student Opportunity Costs Adjusted for the Time Value of Money for Agri-Business Program Enrollees by Semester for the Years 1969-1973	•	32
Table	10	-	Societal Economic Cost of Financial Aid of Agri-Business Program Graduates by Semester, for Classes Graduating in 1971, 1972 and 1973	•	33
Table	11	-	Inventory of Equipment Used in the Agri-Business Program	•	37
Table	12	-	Schedule of Agri-Business Program Estimated Equipment Depreciation by Semester, Assuming a 15 Year Average Life, for the Years 1969-1973	•	39
Table	13	-	Schedule of Non-Instructional Equipment of District One Technical Institute for the Years 1969-1974		40
Table	14	-	Schedule of Agri-Business Program's Share of Estimated Non-Instructional Equipment Depreciation by Semester for the Years 1969-1973	•	41
Table	15	-	Depreciation Schedule by Semester for the Main Building, Assuming a 50 Year Life, District One Technical Institute for the Years 1969-1973	•	43

Table	Business Program Enrollees, By Semester Rank, for the Years 1969-1973	45
Table	16B - Agri-Business Program's Share of Main Building Depreciation Costs for Administration, Ancillary and Other Non-Instructional Cost Categories by Semester for the Years 1960-1973	46
Table	17 - Schedule of Total FTE's in Agri-Business Program by Semester for the Years (Fall) 1969-1973 (Spring)	47
Table	18 - Ancillary and Professional Cash Expenditures as Adjusted to Exclude Non-Agri-Business Program Coordinators Salaries - Full-Time Programs, Total Coordinators - Other Programs, Supervisors - Other Programs Costs	50
Table	19 - Showing Adjustment of Debt Service Account to Exclude Repayment of Principal for the Fiscal Year 1969-1973	51
Table	20 - Computations Schedule of Agri-Business Program's Share of Administration et al Costs for the Years 1969-1973	53
Table	21 - Summary Table of Administrative, Ancillary and Professional Cash Expenditures et al (also at local level) by Semester for the Agri-Business Program for the Years 1969-1973	55
Table	22 - Schedule of FTE's in District One VTAE Agri-Business Program and Total FTE's Generated in the State of Wisconsin's Post Secondary Vocational Schools for the Years 1969-1973	57
Table	23A - Schedule of Agri-Business Program Share of State VTAE Board Administration Costs as Adjusted for the Years 1969-1973	58
Table	23B - Societal Economic Costs Adjusted for the Time Value of Money, By Semester, for the Agri-Business Program for the Years 1969-1973	59
Table	24 - Average Salary Per Month and Average Hours Worked Weekly of Technical Institute Agri-Business Program Graduates for the Years 1971-1973	62
Table	25A - Average Weekly Hours of Technical Institute Agri-Business Program Graduates for 1971-1973 and Estimated Deflators	63
Table	25B - Deflator Adjusted Earnings of Technical Institute Agri- Business Program Graduates for 1971-1973	63
Table	26 - Growth Rates in Starting Salaries of Agri-Business Program Graduates of Classes Graduating in 1971-1973	64
Table	27 - Real Growth Rates in Starting Salaries of Agri-Business Program Graduates of Classes Graduating in 1971-1973	65



Table	28 -	Real Growth Rates in Mean Annual Income in Current Dollars of Male Year Round Full-Time Workers Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School Completed for the Years 1967-1972	66
Table	29 -	Real Growth Rates in Mean Annual Income, in Current collars of Men Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School completed for the Years 1967-1972	68
Table	30 -	Actual and Projected Labor Force Participation Rates and Unemployment Rates for Agri-Business Program Graduates 1971-1973	70
Table	31A	Unadjusted Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a 2% Real Growth Rate, and Mean Annual Earnings Adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment of Male Year Round Full-Time Workers Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School Completed for the Years 1971-1977	72
Table	31B	Actual and Projected Labor Force Participation Rates and Unemployment Rates for Male Year Round Full-Time Workers Age 18-24 for the Years 1971-1977	72
Table	32A	Actual and Projected Labor Force Participation Rates and Unemployment Rates for All Males Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School Completed Only for the Years 1971-1977	73
Table	32B	Unadjusted Expected Mean Annual Income Assuming a 2% Real Growth Rate, and Expected Mean Annual Income Adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment for the Years 1971-1977	73
Table	33A	Deflated Unadjusted Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a 10% Growth Rate, and Expected Annual Earnings Adjusted for Labor Force Participation, and Unemployment of Agri-Business Program Students Graduating in 1971-1973 for the Years 1971-1977	75
Table	33B	Deflated Unadjusted Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a 10% Real Growth Rate, and Expected Annual Earnings Adjusted for Labor Force Participation, and Unemployment of Agri-Business Program Students Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977	76
Table	34A	The Present Value of Deflated Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, of Agri-Business Program Students Graduating in 1971-1973 for the Years 1971-1977	77
Table	34B	The Present Value of Deflated Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, of Agri-Business Program Students Graduating in 1971-1973 for the	
		Years 1971-1977	78



Table	35A	-	The Present Value of Adjusted Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, of Male Year Round Full-Time Workers Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School Completed; Corresponding with Agri-Business Program Students Graduating 1971-1973 for the Years 1971-1977	79
Table	35B	-	The Present Value of Adjusted Expected Mean Annual Income, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, for all Males Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School Completed; Corresponding with Agri-Business Program Students Graduating 1971-1973 for the Years 1971-1977	80
Table	36A	-	The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973	83
Table	36B	-	The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973	84
Table	36C	-	The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973	. 85
Table	36D	-	The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5% for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973	86
Table	36E	-	The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973	87
Table	37A	-	The Net Present Value of Deflated Adjusted Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon of 5 Years and a Private Discount Rate = 5%; for Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977	89
Table	37B	-	The Net Present Value of Deflated Adjusted Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon of 5 Years and a Private Discount Rate = 5%; For Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977	90
Table	37C	-	The Net Present Value of Deflated Adjusted Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon of 5 Years and a Private Discount Rate = 5%; for Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977	91

Table	37D - The Net Present Value of Deflated Adjusted Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon of 5 Years and a Private Discount Rate = 5%; for Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977	92
Table	38 - The Net Present Value of Private Economic Benefits of an Agri-Business Program Graduate, Graduating in 1971-1973, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon and a Private Discount	
	Rate = 5%	94
Table	39A - Private Economic Benefit-Cost Ratios of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Graduating in 1971-1973, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon and a Private Discount Rate = 5%	95
Table	39B - Private Economic Benefit-Cost Ratios of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Graduating in 1971-1973, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon and a Private Discount Rate = 5%	96

## LIST OF APPENDED MATERIALS

APPENDIX 1 - Material Related to Private Economic Costs

APPENDIX 2 - Material Related to Societal Economic Costs



хi

#### INTRODUCTION

There is an inherent tendency to evaluate any program by cost alone. However, the correct measure of value (both societal and private) of a program is
not determined by ranking programs by total costs, with the lower costing programs assigned more value than the higher costing programs or vice versa.
Rather, correct evaluation of a program requires that costs be matched with
benefits. This is the essence of cost benefit analysis.

The major source of societal economic benefits arises from increased output caused either by employing previously unemployed resources or increasing the output of existing employed resources. Basically, this increase in output is measured by total wages earned by the individual after training less the wages that he would have earned without additional training, reduced by the earnings difference that is due solely to any increased motivation or ability of the individual. For society the amount of the economic benefits is gross of income taxes paid by the individual. While in determining private economic benefits, the amount is merely the increase net of income taxes. Sometimes it is argued



 $<sup>^{</sup>m l}$ The effect of adjusting for the increased motivation and ability, of course, is to reduce societal and private economic benefits and lower the resultant benefit-cost ratios. James V. Koch in "A Benefit-Cost Analysis of Vocational Occupational Training at Selected Junior Colleges" incorporates into his general formula an adjustment factor of 25%. However, a study by Mr. Wayne R. Atkins, "A Study of Achievement and Scholastic Aptitude of Freshmen Technical Students at District One Technical Institute, 1970-71, By Program of Studies", showed the Agri-Business students to have ACT scores below the mean for all Midwest Level 1 students taking the test. This would seem to indicate, insofar as the ACT is a measure of ability, that there is no significant difference in ability between high school graduates not enrolled in school and Agri-Business students. The ACT does not measure motivation and it would appear, by the mere fact that the Agri-Business students enrolled in vocational school and the high school graduates did not, that a positive difference in motivation between the groups does exist. The significance of this difference is unknown. Because of these factors, this report does not include an adjustment for increased motivation and ability. Because of the critical importance of this issue, I would recommend that further research be conducted before an adjustment for increased motivation and ability is included.

that societal economic benefits are only the additional income taxes the government receives as the individual receives the remaining increase. However, such analysis confuses society with government. Society, as distinct from the government, enjoys the entire increase in output. Government receives only the additional income taxes. The private individual receives the increased earnings net of taxes. The total of the two must equal societal economic benefits.

The science of economics draws a fine distinction between earnings and income. Earnings accrue only to labor while income may be composed of returns to other factors of production, such as rents, profits and interest as well as earnings.

Barsby, in his cost-benefit study<sup>2</sup> noted:

"When cost and benefit components of a cost-benefit analysis are compared, comparison must be made at a given point in time. Since in most cases both costs and benefits accrue over a period of years, they must be discounted in order to take into account the time factor. There are three common methods of comparing costs with benefits: (1) present value of net benefits, (2) rate of return, and (3) benefit-cost ratio.

"The present value of benefits is calculated by discounting both benefits and costs back to the present (generally to the beginning of the program) and subtracting the calculated value of costs from benefits. This will tell us the absolute size of gain due to the program. Rate of return is calculated by finding the interest rate that will equalize the present value of costs and benefits. This tells us the rate of interest the "investment" in the program is earning. The benefit-cost ratio is calculated by dividing present value of benefits by present value of costs. This tells us how large the gain is relative to the size of the investment. The benefit-cost ratio differs from the present value

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Barsby, Steven L., "The Application of Cost-Benefit Analysis in the Manpower Area", 1970 ED069890, pg. 13.



of net benefits because the latter tells us the <u>absolute size</u> of the gain. The benefit-cost ratio is usually best to use when there are budget constraints, because it allows attention to focus on gain per dollar spent." This study has calculated benefit-cost ratios. However, the data accumulated and presented in this report is sufficient to use to determine results under the other two methods as well.

The Three Methods of Comparing 4
Benefits and Costs

Type of Comparison	Method of Calculation	Decision Rule
1. Present Value of Net Benefits .	1. $\int_{\xi}^{n} \frac{B_{t} - C_{t}}{(1 + i)^{t}}$	<ol> <li>Select the project with the highest net benefits first, then pursue suc- cesive projects in des- cending order of net benefits.</li> </ol>
2. Rate of Return	$ \frac{2 \cdot \prod_{\xi = 0}^{n} \frac{B_{t} - C_{t}}{(1 + r)^{t}} = 0}{t = 0} $	<pre>2. Select the project with     the highest rate of re-     turn(r), then pursue suc-     cesive projects in des-     cending order of r until     r equals some predeter-     mined interest rate(i).</pre>
3. Benefit-Cost Ratio	3. $\underset{t=0}{\overset{n}{\underset{t=0}{\xi}}} \frac{B_{t}}{(1+i)^{t}}$ $\frac{C_{t}}{(1+i)^{t}}$	3. Select the project with the highest B/C, then pursue projects in descending order until B/C=1 or budget exhausted.

Where  $B_t$  = benefits in year t

 $C_t = costs in year t$ 

n = number of years spanned by the analysis

i = social discount rate

r = rate of return

\*Davie's notation is used here because of its simplicity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Each of the methods described above for comparing costs and benefits of a program has deficiencies that, under certain conditions, can result in an "incorrect" decision. These deficiencies are discussed in many places. See, for example, (66, pp. 49-69). (Barsby's footnote)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup><u>Ibid</u>., p. 14.

This study focuses on the Agri-Business-Machinery Partsman-Salesman Program at District One Technical Institute. According to the school catalog,
"The Agri-Business program in Eau Claire is designed to provide training for distribution positions specializing in agricultural products and equipment.

The machinery partsman salesman program deals chiefly with farm implements and equipment from a businessman's view point." It covers classes graduating in 1971-72 and 1973 from the program. Further, this cost benefit study has been confined to measuring and comparing economic costs with economic benefits; consequently non-economic costs and benefits were not considered. However, it was assumed that the size and direction of the non-economic costs and benefits would not alter the results of the study.

Two hypotheses from those suggested by Mr. Krogstad were adopted:

- 1. That the private economic benefits (PEB)>private economic costs (PEC)
- 2. That the societal economic benefits (SEB) > societal economic costs (SEC).

The first hypothesis reflects the incentive or the expected condition necessary to attract students to enter the program. The second hypothesis reflects the condition necessary for society to offer the program to students. Societal and private non-economic costs and benefits are ignored. As a result the following unfavorable conditions could also exist:

- (1) PNEB < PNEC
- (2) PNEB + PEB < PEC + PNEC
- (3) SNEB < SNEC
- (4) SEB + SNEB < SEC + SNEC

Again, it is assumed in this report that the amount and direction of the non-economic factors will not alter the results of the report.

Throughout my study I have used a 5-year time horizon and social and private discount rates = 5%.



CHAPTER ONE

PRIVATE ECONOMIC COSTS



18

Private Economic Costs - The General Formula:

$$PEC = [O_1 + E_1] - A_1F_1 + [O_2 + E_2] - A_2F_2$$

Where:

PEC = private economic costs

O = student opportunity cost

E = other school related expenses

A = percentage of students receiving financial aid who are in Agri-Business Program

F = the average dollar amount of financial aid received by students
 in Agri-Business Program

Housing, food and travel costs were ignored in that it was assumed that these costs would occur regardless of whether the student attended school or not. Foregone production at home while at school was also ignored in that it was assumed production would be foregone at home whether one attended school or went to work. The model does reflect the decreased value of money over time, school costs such as tuition fees, books, and supplies, etc., and foregone earnings while in school (i.e. opportunity costs). The most important component of private economic costs is the student opportunity cost. The other school related costs are minimal (see Appendix 1). Table 1 shows the average financial aid received by Agri-Business graduates.

Student Opportunity Costs - The General Formulae:

$$0 = \left[ (Y_1 A_1 U_1 (1 + i)^1) - S_1 \right] + \left[ (Y_2 A_2 U_2) - S_2 \right], \text{ or }$$

$$0 = \left[ (Z_1 A_1 U_1 (1 + i)^1) - S_1 \right] + \left[ (Z_2 A_2 U_2) - S_2 \right]$$

Where:

O = opportunity cost for Agri-Business Program graduates

Y = mean income of male year round full-time workers 18-24 completing 4 years of high school only

A = labor force participation rates of high school graduates not enrolled in school in October of year of graduation

U = 1-unemployment rate of high school graduates not enrolled in school in October of year of graduation



- s = expected summer earnings of Agri-Business Program enrollee 10/52 x adjusted Y or adjusted Z
- i = private discount rate = 5%
- z = mean income of male workers 18-24 completing 4 years of high school
   only

#### The Model Opportunity Costs

The income that a high school graduate who does not pursue further education could expect to earn must be modified by the joint probability of his labor force participation (determined by labor force participation rates) and his securing employment (determined by 1-unemployment rate).

The labor force participation rates (see Table 6) refers to the percentage of the "civilian non-institutional population in the civilian labor force". reason for the inclusion of this figure is to adjust for any periodic withdrawals from the labor force. (e.g. women have in the past frequently left the labor force) According to James V. Koch, author of the study entitled "A Benefit-Cost Analysis of Vocational-Occupational Training at Selected Junior Colleges" , "the effect of it (i.e. periodic withdrawals from labor force) is to lower the stream of income which accures to the individual", consequently lowering both the personal and social rates of return. However, while the labor force participation rates reflect participation in the labor force it does not account for unemployment experienced while in the labor force. Koch study ignores this aspect. Consequently, I have included 1-the unemployment rate to adjust for this problem. Nationwide figures were used in determining employed labor force participation (see Table 6). (The effect of using nationwide figures probably upwardly distorts the results) Without this adjustment for unemployment, the above model would imply that work is both



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>James V. Koch, "The Benefit-Cost Analysis of Vocational-Occupational Training at Selected Junior Colleges", State of Illinois Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1974, p. 10.

available and attainable by high school graduates without further training. However, as noted by the attached unemployment rates tables, that assumption may not be correct. In that case the relevant opportunity costs for a student facing either unemployment or vocational school would be zero as zero earnings are foregone by securing admission and entry into a vocational school program. Society has an opportunity cost in either event, however.

Further, this model implies that a student would either (1) work, or (2) go to vocational school (entering the program under consideration). However, this analysis ignores the possibility of having a third alternative of going to college instead of going to work. In this case the relevant societal opportunity costs would be zero. Dr. Ghazalah would argue that in the absence of the work alternative, the individual would still have an opportunity cost even though society would not have one.

The unemployment and labor force participation rates for high school graduates in time 1 (see Table 6) are assumed to change in time 2 for time 1 high school graduates to the rate experienced by time 2 high school graduates. In determining which rates to use, the rate for white males was selected as this best represents the population of Agri-Business Program majors (there were no women enrollees or minority group member enrollees in the Agri-Business Program according to the Student Services Department).

Some would argue that student opportunity costs should not be reduced for the labor force participation rates of high school graduates not enrolled in school if that rate is less than one. This argument is as follows: the vocational school student goes to vocational school for one purpose and one purpose only—to train for a job. Therefore, if they had not entered vocational



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Ismail Ghazalah, "Role of Vocational Education in Improving Skills and Earning Capacity in the State of Ohio: A Cost Benefit Study", State of Ohio, Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, p. 16.

school then they <u>would</u> have entered the labor force; hence, the labor force participation rate of the population of vocational school students would equal one. Consequently, a labor force participation rate of one should be used. This issue is important as the effect of using labor force participation rates less than one is to reduce opportunity cost and as a result to increase private economic benefits and societal economic benefits and hence increase benefit—cost ratios. However, the above argument ignores these reasons for labor force non-participation and further implicitly assumes those reasons to be voluntary only. (see Reasons Outside Labor Force). Reasons such as illness or disability, school attendance (perhaps college), or home responsibilities, etc., are likely to make the labor force participation rates of vocational school students less than one.

REASONS FOR BEING OUTSIDE LABOR FORCE, BY SEX, 1972\*
(Thousands of persons 16 years and over)

Labor Force Status	Total	Men	Women
Civilian non-institutional population	143,326	67,458	75,868
In civilian labor force	86,542	53,265	33,277
Not in labor force	56,785	14,192	42,591
Do not want job now, total	52,321	12,845	39,476
Current activity: In school	6,301	3,215	3,086
Ill, disabled	4,313	2,250	2,063
Homemaker	32,384		32,194
Retired, old	6,691	•	984
Other	2,632	1,488	1,144
Want job now, total	4,461	1,347	3,114
Reason not looking: School attendance	1,200	612	588
Ill health, disability	632	271	361
Home responsibilities	1,098	24	1,074
Think cannot get job	765	240	525
All other reasons	766	200	566

<sup>\*</sup>Reprinted from The Manpower Report of the President, 1973.



If mean income (whether year round full-time worker or all males) is used then since this is the mean income of the age group 18-24, one might argue that the interest rate adjustment should be excluded for the first year to avoid further upward bias (if any) of the data. The argument being that the mean income is upwardly distorted by those at the higher age of the interval. Specifically, because they are older, they are earning more money (assuming that income increases with age). Consequently, to increase mean income again by the interest rate adjustment would upwardly bias the opportunity costs. However, this analysis still ignores the time value of money.

A more serious objection arises to using mean income of all males and adjusting for probability of unemployment. Essentially, earnings are a function of the wage per hour and the number of hours worked. The mean income of all males it is felt reflects periods of less than full-time employment and more importantly periods of unemployment experienced by the age group 18-24. Hence, to adjust for this factor again through multiplying by 1-unemployment rate, would be misleading. However, the mean income of all males 18-24 completing four years of high school only does not reflect those in the labor force who remain unemployed year round without income. Again, the issue is importan as the effect of adjusting mean income of all males by 1-unemployment rate is to increase private economic benefits and societal economic benefits and consequently the benefit-cost ratios. If the mean income of year round full-time workers is used in 'ead, then the unemployment problem is eliminated. But, the question that arises then, is it fair to use the mean income of year round full-time workers to determine opportunity costs when the universe of jobs available to high school graduates includes less than full-time and in some cases less than year round positions? As a result, I have incorporated both mean income figures into the opportunity cost calculations.



Tables 2A and 2B show the conversion of calendar year mean income data to academic year data; an adjustment necessary in order to calculate the mean income earned during the academic year.

Tables 3A and 3B show the adjustment of academic year mean income for labor force participation and unemployment. The resultant net earnings figures are further reduced by summer earnings. (Case 1 summer earnings were computed by multiplying 10/52 x mean income adjusted for labor force participation and unemployment, of male year round full-time workers) The two unadjusted (for time value of money) opportunity costs that result for each table depend on what assumption is made for summer earnings. The labor force participation and unemployment rates used to adjust the summer earnings of Agri-Business students due to lack of available data were assumed to be the same as those of the population of high school graduates not enrolled in school. The most recent study (Table 4) of labor force status in summer of students enrolled in school was conducted by the Labor Department in 1969. However, the results of that study do not differ significantly from the results of the method employed due to data limitations. Summer earnings were computed by multiplying 10/52 by mean income. This was done due to the lack of available accurate data on summer earnings. It would seem that this procedure would establish a range of expected summer earnings with 10/52 of the mean income of male year round full-time workers being the highest and 10/52 of the mean income of all male workers being the lowest.

Table 5 summarizes the student opportunity costs, per Agri-Business enrollee, adjusted and unadjusted for the time value of money, using both the mean
income of all male workers, Case 1 and the mean income of male year round fulltime workers, Case 2. Ease case is further subdivided into two subcases; Case 1
and Case 2. The student opportunity costs that result are contingent upon what



TABLE 1

Average Financial Aid\* Received by Semester for Agri-Business Graduates By Graduating Classes for 1971, 1972, 1973

1973				62.50	subsidy
1972				62.50	interest
1972			12.50	104.68	excludes all loans and work-study. It also ignores any interest subsidy
1971			12.50	104.68	It also i
1971		88.91			rk-study.
1970		88.91			ans and wc
1970		22.73			des all lo
1969		22.73			here exclu
	Graduating Class:	1971	1972	1973	*Financial Aid here on loans.

Data was obtained from Financial Aid files for actual graduating classes 1971-73.

#### Case 1

#### TABLE 2A

Schedule Converting Calendar Year Mean Income in Current Dollars
Of Males 18-24 Attaining 4 Years of High School Education Only
To Academic Year Income for the Years 1969-1972

	1969	1970	1971	1972
Calendar Year*	\$3,989 (x 7/12 + x	\$4,172 5/12) (x 7/12 -	\$4,195 + 5/12) (x 7/12	\$4,837 + x 5/12) (x1)
Academic Year	\$4,065.25	\$4,181.54	\$4,462.50	\$4,837.00

\*Source: Table 2 "Mean Income in 1956 to 1972 of Men, by Selected Age Group and Years of School Completed". Current Population Reports, Consumer Income: Annual Mean Income Lifetime Income and Educational Attainment of Men in the United States for Selected Years 1956-1972.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census Series P-60 No. 92, March, 1974.

#### Case 2

#### TABLE 2B

Schedule Converting Calendar Year Mean Income in Current Dollars
Of Male of Year Round Full-Time Worker Age 18-24 Attaining 4
Years of High School Education Only to Academic Year
Mean Income for the Years 1969-1972

	1969	1970	<u>1971</u>	1972
Calendar Year*	\$6,157 (x 7/12 + x	\$6,493 5/12) (x 7/12 +	\$6,993 x 5/12) (x 7/12	\$6,927 2 + 5/12) (x1)
Academic Year	\$6,297.00	\$6,457.33	\$6,615.50	\$6,927.00

\*Source: Table 5 "Mean Income in 1967 to 1972 of Male Year Round Full-Time Workers, by Selected Age Group and Years of School Completed". Current Population Reports; Consumer Income: Annual Mean Income, Lifetime Income and Educational Attainment of Men in the United States for Selected Years 1956-1972. U. S. Department of Commerce Social and Economic Statistics Administration Bureau of the Census Series P-60 No. 92, March, 1974.



## Case 1

TABLE 3A

Schedule of Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees Using Mean Income, in Current Dollars, of Males Age 18-24 Attaining 4 Years of High School Only for the Academic Years 1969-1972

	1969	1970	1971	1972
Academic Year Mean Income	\$4,065.25	\$4,181.59	\$4,462.50	\$4,837.00
Labor Force Participation Rate l	x 90.0%	x 87.4%	x 90.0%	x 91.2%
1 - Unemployment Rate	x 92.4%	x 87.1%	x 86.0%	x 87.7%
NET EARNINGS	\$3,380.66	\$3,183.25	\$3,453.98	\$3,868.75
Less Adjusted Summer Earnings:				
Case 1	\$ 767.12	\$ 802.28	\$ 806.70	\$ 930.16
Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs	2,513.54	2,380.97	2,547.28	2,938.59
Case 2	1,007.08	944.41	984.65	1,065.42
Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs	\$2,373.58	\$2,238.84	\$2,469.63	\$2,803.33



### CASE 2

#### TABLE 3B

Schedule of unadjusted student opportunity costs of Agri-Business Program enrollees using mean income, in current dollars, of male year around, full-time workers age 18-24 attaining 4 years of high school only for the academic years 1969-1972.

	1969	1970	<u>1971</u>	1972
Academic Year Mean Income	\$6,297.00	\$6,457.33	\$6,615.00	\$6,927.00
Labor Force Participation Rate *1	x 90%	x 87.4%	x 90%	x 91.2%
1-Unemployment Rates *1	<u>x 92.4%</u>	x 87.1%_	x 86%_	<u>x 87.7%</u>
Net Earnings	\$5,236.59	\$4,911.10	\$5,120.40	\$5,540.38
Less Adjusted Summer Earnings:	,			
Case 1	767.12	802.28	806.70	930.16
Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs	\$ <u>4,469.47</u>	\$4,108.82	\$4,313.70	\$ <u>4,610.22</u>
Case 2	1,007.08	944.41	984.65	1,065.42
Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs	\$4,229.51	\$3,966.69	\$ <u>4.135.75</u>	\$ <u>4,474.96</u>

\*1 Source: Table 32 "Employment Status of High School Graduates Not Enrolled in College and of School Dropouts as of October of Year of Graduation or Dropout, by sex, Marital Status of Women, and Color 1959-1972." Handbook of Labor Statistics 1973. United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

\* Adjusted Summer Earnings were computed as follows: This procedure was followed to arrive at both Case 1 and Case 2 figures.

<u>Calendar Year Mean Income</u> <u>Summer Vacation</u> x 10/52 <u>Calendar Weekly</u>

x LFPR'S of H/S Grads in Oct. of Grad Yr.

x 1-Unemployment role of above group

= Adjusted Summer Earnings



TABLE 4

Labor Force Status in Summer of 1969 of White Males 18-21

Enrolled in School in October 1969

	18 & 19	20 & 21
In labor force for summer job only	60.2%	57.5%
Worked during summer	56.3%	53.5%
Looked but didn't find a summer job	3.9%	4.0%
Worked at job not for summer only	29.7%	27.1%
Didn't participate in labor force during summer	10.1%	15.4%
Total labor force participation during summer	89.9%	84.6%
Summer unemployment rate	3.9%	4.0%

Source: Table is based on and is a partial reprint of Table A
"Labor Force Status in Summer 1969 of Persons 16-21 Years
Old Enrolled in School in October 1969, by Age, Sex, and
Color October 1969" Students and Summer Jobs October 1969.
Special Labor Force Report 128, United States Department
of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics 1971.



TABIE 5 Unadjusted and Adjusted Student Opportunity Costs per Enrollee by Semester\* for the Academic Years 1969-1972

1973			\$1,469.30 1,401.66		2,770.19 2,237.48			1,542.76 1,471.74		2,908.70 2,349.36
1972			\$1,469.30 1,401.66		2,770.19			1,542.76 1,471.74		2,908.70 2,349.36
1972			\$1,273.64 1,234.81		2,560.20 2,067.88			1,337.32		2,688.21
1971			\$1,273.64 1,234.81		2,560.20 2,067.88			1,337.32		2,688.21 2,171.27
1971			\$1,190.49 1,119.42		2,455.55 1,983.35			1,250.01 1,175.39		2,578.33
1970			\$1,190.49 1,119.42		2,455.55 1,983.35			1,250.01		2,578.33
1970			\$1,256.77 1,186.76		2,618.30 2,114.76			1,319.61 1,245.10		2,749.21 2,220.50
1969			\$1,256.77 1,186.76		2,618.30 2,114.76			1,319.61 1,245.10		2,749.21 2,220.50
•	UNADJUSTED:	CASE 1	Case 1 sc Case 2 sc	CASE 2	Case 1 sc Case 2 sc	ADJUSTED:	CASE 1	Case 1 sc Case 2 sc	CASE 2	Case 1 sc Case 2 sc
				 	30	pe:	_			

\*Semester student opportunity costs were computed by dividing academic year costs in half.



summer earnings assumption is made. For example, CASE 1, Case 2 means the student opportunity cost was computed by using the adjusted mean income of all male workers reduced by summer earnings (calculated by multiplying 10/52 by the mean income of all male year round full-time workers).

Table 6 is reprinted from the <u>Handbook of Labor Statistics 1973</u>. It is the source of the labor force participation and unemployment rates used for the population of male high school graduates 18-24 years old and not enrolled in school.

Tables 7A, 7B, 7C, and 7D are schedules of the private economic costs per enrollee in the Agri-Business Program. The differences are due solely to the different student opportunity cost assumptions. For the first academic year of each graduating class time adjusted figures were used; for the second academic year unadjusted student opportunity costs were used.



## TABLE 6

32. Employment Status of High School Graduates Not Enrolled in College and of Carbol Dropouts as of October of Year pation or Dropout, by Sex, Marital Status of Women, and Color, 1959—72—Continued

to 24 years of age; numbers in thousands)

			High sel	iool grad	iuates					Schoo	l dropou	its		
			Civil	an labor	forco					Civilia	an lahor	force		
Item	Civilian noniusti- tutional	'1	rotal	_	Uner	uployed	Not in labor	Civilian noninstr- tutional		cal		Uner	ubloxed	Not in
,	popula- tion	Num- ber	Percent of popu- lation	Em- ployed	Num- ber	Percent of civil- ian labor force	force	tion tion	Nur i	l'ercent	Em- ployed		Percent of civil- ian labor forco	force
1966	1,303	1156	75,7	846	140	14.2	317	206		tel, 7	141	31	78.0	Ui
	498 805 668	435 551 485	57, 3 68, 4 72, 6	397 449 399	38 102 86	8.7 18.5 17.7	63 254 183	152 114 75	121	51.6 42.1 (1)	101 40 35	23 8 5	18.5 (°) (°)	28 66 32
d, widowed, di- d, separatedother races	137 1,160 113	66 843 66	48.2 77.0 65.0	50 778 68	16 115 25	(3) 12, 9 (3)	71 267 50	39 215 48		3) (3)	5 116 22	22	15.6 (1)	34 77 17
1947	1, 214	956	78.7	801	155	16. 2	258	301	l no i	65. 1	j.49	47	24. 0	10.
	181 730 630		86, 6 73, 6 77, 0	379 422 384		9. 5 21. 4 21. 0	65 193 144	157 111 91		82, 2 46, 5 52, 1	104 45 33		19. 4 (1) (1)	21 7 4.
d, withowed, divorced, aled,		817	51. 0 70. 0 72. 7	34 724 73		(4) 14, 0 33, 0	49 217 41	50 239 62	1:5	(*) -65, 7 (*)	12 132 27	6 35 12	(1) 22. 3 (1)	31 81 21
1900 1	1, 162	001	77.8	782	122	13. 5	258		4	13. 4	164	. '	21.2	12
	436 1 725 1 591	520		315 437 380	83	10, 2 16, 0 15, 4	206	151	1 ;	75. 7 89. 0 14. 7	111 53 35	21 16	17, 2 (1) (1)	4
q, widowed, divorced, rated	135 999 163	775	52. 6 77. 4 70. 1	57 684 98	91	(*) 11. 7 24. 0		4 - 257		(4 1 6, 5 (4)	17 131 30	37	(1) 21. 6 (1)	9
1969 M	1,326	1, 049	79. 1	029	120	11.4		-	-!	60.9	182	-	-	14
	617	563	71,6	450	83	7. 6 14. 7 14. 0	223 153	166	11.1	37. 1 41. 1	13: 47 3:	15		10
ed, widowed, divorced, trated	1, 139 1, 142	910	79. 7	834	76		70 232 45	1 25	, 1	(4) 170. 1 64. 0		. 29	16, 8	l i
1970 nl	. 1, 330	1, 027	77. 2	841	186	18, 1	307	37	,	62.0	-   <del></del> -	j		·!
	60. 725 583	501	100.0	250	3   114	23.0	1 2:13	-			1 6	1 19 5   14	21, 6 	1
rd, widowed, presd, separated	1, 177		1 78.1	77	$2 \mid 150$	16.	3 25 3 4:	5   29	4   ···	(*) (3. 9 55. 0	14.	2 47		1
1971 al	1, 330	5 1,051	78.7	87	0 181	. 17.	2 28	5 35	3	66, t	17:	s 5	21.3	-!
	55 75: 61'		₹   60a.9	i 42	0   105	3 20.	5 22	7   1 ;		81, 2 45, 9 52, 8	1 5	4 1 1	3 (4)	
ed, widowed, orced, separated	. ( 1, 19	6 91	1 79.3	3   80		3 \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		n   2"	7 7 3 6 2	(4) 03.4 † (4)	1. 15	6 ! l'	3 (1) 23, 2	:
1972 al	1,50	4 4, 23	7 82.	2 1,05	5 18	2 14.	7 26	7 3	3 43	t	-1-	-1		-!
	1 67	3 1 45	5 75.	0 J - 61	S   10	7 )7.	1   26	ր, իր	61 3.2 61 91 55 .1	10.0	6   1	a   2 a   2 	7 (1) (2).7	
ed, widowed, divorced urated	l, 1,32	15 12 1,09 12 1 13	н 53,	1   90	39 2 34 13 01 1		2 2:	24 3	78 198 98 198 95 35	63.1	2   15	5 5	6 (4) 25, 6 2 (4)	5

not avidlalne by color. Vallable, 4

Percent not shown where base is less than 100,000.
 Percent not shown who o base is less than 75,000.

This column is the labor force participation rates of high school graduates.

32

87

था नाताः

Schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for classes graduating in 1971-73.

	1971		1972	2	1973	Э
	1969-70	1970-71	1970-71	1971-72	1971-72	1972-73
Tuition	0	0	0	0	0	0
Books & Supplies	. 99	65	. 65	65	65	65
Laboratory Fees	13	27	13	27	13	27
Enrollment Test & ACT	8.50	C	8.50	0	8.50	0
Career Personality Profile Test	3.00	0	3.00	0	3.00	0 .
Graduation Fee	00.6	0	00.6	0	00.6	0
Student Opportunity Cost (using mean income of all male workers)	2,639.22	2,380.98	2,500.22	2,547.28	2,674.64	2,938.60
Gross Private Economic Costs	2,737.72	2,472.98	2,598.72	2,639.28	2,773.14	3,030.60
Less Average Financial Aid received	45.46	177.82	0	25	209.36	135
Net Private Economic Costs	2,692.26	2,295.16	2,598.72	2,614.28	2,563.78	2,895.60

19

Schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for classes graduating in 1971-73.

TABLE 7B

	1971	ra T	1972	2	1973	ڌِ	
	1969-70	1970-71	1970-71	1971-72	1971-72	1972-73	
Tuition		0	0	0	0	0	
Books & Supplies	65.00	65.00	65.00	65.00	65.00	65,00	
Laboratory Fees	13.00	27.00	13.00	27.00	13.00	27.00	
Enrollment Test & ACT	8.50	0	8.50	0	8.50	0	
Career Personality Profile Test	3.00	0	3.00	0	3.00	0	
Graduation Fee	9.00	0	00.6	0	00.6	0	
Student Opportunity Cost $\frac{2}{(\text{using mean income of all males})^*}$	2,490.20	2,238.84	2,251.76	2,469.62	2,593.10	2,803.30	
Gross Private Economic Costs	2,588.70	2,330.84	2,349.26	2,561.62	2,691.60	2,895.32	
Less Average Financial Aid received	45,46	177.82	0	25	209.36	135	
Net Private Economic Costs	2,543.24	2,153.02	2,349.26	2,536.62	2,482.24	2,760.32	

<sup>\*</sup>Student Opportunity Costs were determined using mean income of all males reduced by summer earnings (10/52 x mean earnings of a year round full-time worker).

schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for classes graduating in 1971-73.

TABLE 7C

•	1971	-	1972	7.2	1973	73
	1969-70	1970-71	1970-71	1971-72	1971-72	1972-73
Tuition	0	0	0	0	0,	0
Books & Supplies	65	65	65	65	65	65
Laboratory Fees	13	27	13	27	13	27
Enrollment Test & ACT	8.50	0	8.50	0	8.50	0
Career Personality Profile Test	3.00	0	3.00	0	3.00	0
Graduation Fee	9.00	0	00.6	0	00.6	0
Student Opportunity Cost (using mean income of year round full-time worker)	5,498.42	4,911.10	5,156.66	5,120.40	5,376.42	5,540.28
Gross Private Economic Costs	5,596.92	5,003.10	5,225.16	5,212.40	5,474.92	5,632.28
Less Average Financial Aid received	45.46	1.77.82	0	25	209.36	135
Net Private Economic Costs	5.551.46	4,825.28	5,225.16	5,187.40	5,265.56	5,497.28

TABLE 7D

Schedule of Private Economic Costs of Agri-Business Program Enrollees, Per Enrollee, by Academic Year for classes graduating in 1971-73.

	1371		1972	01	1973	m
	1969-70	1970-71	1970-71	1971-72	1971-72	1972-73
Tuition	0	0	0	Ο.	0	0
Books & Supplies	. 00*59	65.00	65.00	65.00	65.00	65.00
Laboratory Fees	13.00	27.00	13.00	27.00	13.00	27.00
Enrollment Test & ACT	8.50	0	8.50	0	8.50	0
Career Personality Profile Test	3.00	0	3.00	0	3.00	0
Graduation Fee	9.00	0	00.6		00.6	0
Student Opportunity Cost $\frac{4}{4}$ (using mean income of all males)**	4,441.00	3,966.70	4,165.02	4,135.76	4,342,54	4,474,96
Gross Private Economic Costs	4,539.50	4,058.70	4,263.52	4,227.76	4,441.04	4,566.96
Less Average Financial Aid received	45.46	177.82	0	25	209	135
Net Private Economic Costs	4,494.04	3,880.88	4,263.52	4,202.76	4,232.04	4,431.96

<sup>\*\*</sup>Student Opportunity Costs were determined using mean income of male year round full-time workers reduced by summer earnings (10/52 x mean income of male year round full-time workers).

TABLE 8A

Instructional Costs\* by Semester Rank for Agri-Business Program Enrollees for the years 1969-1973

	1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
Instructional Costs:								
Semester Rank	/		/	/				
lst	\$4027.40		\$4781.73		\$6928.25			
2nd		\$3740.49		\$5325.08		\$5114.13		
3rđ			\$2959.88		\$3161.50		\$2606.40	
4th				\$2658.80		\$3172.32		\$2653.92
1971 Class				\$13386.57				
1972 Class						\$16440.63		
1973 Class								\$17302.70

\*See supporting tables for details of instructional cos...



TABLE 8B
SHOWING AGRI-BUSINESS ENROLLMENT
BY SEMESTER RANK FOR THE YEARS 1969-1973

•	lst	2nd	3rd	4th	Total
1969 lst Semester	13	1	11	0	25
1970 2nd Semester	2	13)	1	7	23
1970 lst Semester	(19	1	(11	4	32
1971 2nd Semester	3	17)	1	10)	31
1971 lst Semester	25 .	2	(10	0	37
1972 2nd Semester	5	21	1	8	35
1972 1st Semester	17	2	(12	3	34
1973 2nd Semester	8	15	2	12)	37

Data obtained from District One VTAE Student Services Department's Enrollment Reports for the academic year 1969-1973.



CHAPTER TWO SOCIETAL ECONOMIC COSTS



# SOCIETAL ECONOMIC COSTS

The computation of societal economic costs required first the identification of the components of societal economic costs. Following closely suggested guidelines, modified for audit reports classifications, the components were identified as follows:

- (1) Instructional Costs (Teachers)
- (2) Student Opportunity Costs
- (3) Average Financial Aid Given
- (4) Equipment Depreciation
- (5) Building Depreciation
- (6) Ancillary and Professional
- (7) Administration Local
- (8) Debt Service
- (9) Operation and Maintenance
- (10) Transportation
- (11) Fixed Charges
- (12) Transfers to Clearing Accounts
- (13) Outgoing Transfers Accounts
- (14) School Sales (Net Expenditures)
- (15) Food Services (Net Receipts or Net Expenditures)
- (16) State Administration



Since the study focused on classes graduating in 1971, 1972 and 1973, it was necessary to reflect only the enrollment associated with these classes.

Consequently, I made a simplifying assumption. I assumed that each graduating class entered in the fall of two years preceding graduation (for example, the 1971 graduating class entered in the fall of 1969 as first semester rank enrollees and costs reflect only first semester rank students). This assumption is important for it is these enrollment numbers (See Table 8) that were used to arrive at total semester costs for "per enrollee cost categories"—instructional costs, financial aid, and student opportunity costs. The encircled numbers on Table 8 show the enrollment figures I used to calculate semester costs as well as the semester rank groups.

Next, I determined the required course schedule for Agri-Business Program students using District One Technical Institute catalogs for 1969-71 or the catalog for 1971-73. I assumed that each enrollee followed the required course schedule for his semester rank. Where electives existed I selected one course and assumed that all of the same semester rank enrollees took that course. The selection of electives was determined after consulting with instructors of the Agri-Business Program. This necessitated the construction of a required course schedule showing what teachers taught, what course, and how many sections of each course they taught (See Appendix). This latter refinement was necessary to determine a weighted average cost per enrollee. Since with many sections available, a student could have enrolled in any one of several sections, I assumed that each section had a random probability of selection. Consequently, I weighted instructional cost per course by number of sections a teacher taught (See Appendix) and divided by total enrollment to arrive at a weighted average cost per enrollee.



Instructional Costs:

$$IC = \propto $X$$

Where:

IC = Instructional costs per course

C = Salary and fringe benefits

N = Actual enrollment for the course

 $\frac{IC}{N}$  = Cost per enrollee

n  $\nleq \underline{IC} = \text{Semester instructional costs per enrollee}$ +=1  $\overline{N}$ 

Total semester instructional costs were, of course, a mere accumulation of costs per course. The annual reports to the state contained teacher salary allotments per course. These costs were adjusted for estimated fringe benefits ranging from 112 percent in 1969-70 to 120 percent in 1972-73.

After the cost per enrollee was determined then it was mutliplied by the number of enrollees of the appropriate semester rank in the Agri-Business Program to arrive at a semester cost per course for the program (See Appendix). This process was repeated for each course for each semester from 1969-1973. Table 9 is a table of instructional costs by semester rank for the Agri-Business Program.



### STUDENT OPPORTUNITY COSTS

The calculation of student opportunity costs was explained in the previous section on private economic costs. The societal economic costs, student opportunity costs are merely the sum of the individual opportunity costs. It was calculated by multiplying the student opportunity cost per enrollee by the number of enrollees. Tables 9A, B, C, and D show total student opportunity costs under the various assumptions as to adjusted mean income and summer earnings.

Table 10 shows the financial aid given to graduates of the Agri-Business Program. Only outright grants were included for consideration; loans and workstudy were ignored; as was any interest subsidy on loans. The information was obtained from the financial aid office files at the District One Technical Institute.



For Agri-Business Program Enrollees, by Semester for the Years 1369-1973 Student Opportunity Costs\* Adjusted for the Time Value of Money

TABLE 9A

1973				\$ 1,401.66	x 12	\$16,819.92			
1972				\$ 1,401.66 \$ 1,401.66	x 12	\$16,819.92			
1972	\$ 1,296.55	× 21	\$27,217.55	\$ 1,234.81	α ×	\$ 9,894.48			\$64,556.62
1971	\$ 1,296.55	x 25	\$32,413.75	\$ 1,234.81	× 10	\$12,348.10			\$64,
1971	\$ 1,175.39	x 17	\$19,981.63	\$ 1,119.42	× 10	\$11,194.20		\$55,880.42	
1970	\$ 1,175.39	x 19	\$22,331.41	\$ 1,119.42	x 11	\$12,313.62		\$55	
1970	\$ 1,245.10	x 13	\$16,186.30						
1969	\$ 1,245.10	s x 13	\$16,186.30						
	Adjusted Student Oppor- tunity Costs	No. of 1st and 2nd Semester Rank Enrollees		<pre>fnadjusted Student Oppor-</pre>		<b>!4</b>	Cost of Agri-Business Class Graduating:	1971	2972

\*The mean income of all males 18-24 completing 4 years of high school only and adjusted for labor force participation, unemployment, the time value of money, and reduced by expected summer earnings (10/52 x adjusted mean income of males 18-24 year round full-time workers).

1973

\$93,271.14

# TABLE 9B

For Agri-Eusiness Program Enrollees by Semester for the Years 1969-1973 Student Opportunity Costs\* Adjusted for the Time Value of Money

	1969	1970	.1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
Adjusted Student Oppor- tunity Costs	Oppor- \$ 1,319.61	\$ 1,319.61	\$ 1,250.11	\$ 1,250.01	\$ 1,337.01	\$ 1,337.32	·	
No. of 1st and 2nd Semester Rank En	and 2nd Rank Enrollees x 13	× 13	× 19	x 17	× 25	x 21		
	\$17,154.93	\$17,154.93	\$23,750.19	\$21,250.17	\$33,433.00	\$28,083.72		
Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs	it sts		\$ 1,190.49	\$ 1,190.49	\$ 1,273.64	\$ 1,273.64	\$ 1,469.30	\$ 1,469.30
No. of 3rd and 4th   Semester Rank Enrollees	th inrollees		x 11	x 10.9	× 10	ω ×	× 12	× 12
4.			\$13,095.39	\$11,904.90	\$12,736.40	\$10,189.12	\$17,631.60	\$17,631.60
Class Graduating:	iness 19 :					·		
1971			,65\$	\$59,310.15				
1972				٠	\$67,	\$67,925.88		
1973							,96\$	\$96,779.92

\*The mean income of all males 18-24 completing 4 years of high school only and adjusted for labor force participation, unemployment, the time value of money, and reduced by expected summer earnings (10/52 x adjusted mean income of same) was used.



# TABLE 90

For Agri-Business Program Enrollees, by Semester for the Years 1969-1973 Student Opportunity Costs\* Adjusted for the Time Value of Money

ωl				7.48	(7)
1973				\$ 2,23	x 12
1972				\$ 1,983.35 \$ 1,983.35 \$ 2,067.88 \$ 2,067.88 \$ 2,237.48 \$ 2,237.48	× 12
1972	\$ 2,171.27	× 21	\$45,596.67	\$ 2,067.88	ω ×
1971	\$ 2,171.27	× 25	\$54,281.75	\$ 2,067.88	× 10
1971	\$ 2,082.51 \$ 2,082.51 \$ 2,171.27 \$ 2,171.27	x 17	\$39,567.69 \$35,402.69 \$54,281.75 \$45,596.67	\$ 1,983.35	× 10
1970	\$ 2,082.51	x 19	\$39,567.69	\$ 1,983.35	, x 11
1970	\$ 2,220.50 \$ 2,220.50	x 13	\$28,866.50		
1969	\$ 2,220.50	- x 13	\$28,866.50		
	Adjusted Student Oppor- tunity Costs	No. of 1st and 2nd Semes- ter Rank Enrollees		Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs	No. of 3rd and 4th Semes- ter Rank Enrollees

Cost of Agri-Business Class Graduating:

\$26,849.76

\$26,849.76

\$16,543,04

\$20,678.80

\$19,833.50

\$21,816.85

\$112,192.20 \$99,383,35 1972 1973 1971

\$153,577.94

\*The mean income of male year round full-time workers completing 4 years of high school only and adjusted for labor force participation, unemployment, the time value of money, and reduced by expected summer earnings (10/52 x adjusted mean income of male 18-24 year round full-time workers).

# TABLE 9D

For Agri-Business Program Enrollees by Semester for the Years 1969-1973 Student Opportunity Costs\* Adjusted for the Time Value of Money

Adjusted Student Oppor-	1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
tunity Costs No. of 1st and 2nd Semes- ter Rank Enrollees	\$ 2,749.21 - x 13	\$ 2,749.21 × 13	\$ 2,578.33	\$ 2,578.33 × 17	\$ 2,688.21 x 25	\$ 2,688.21 x 21		
	\$35,739.73	\$35,739.73	\$48,988.27	\$43,831.61	\$67,205.25	\$56,452.41		
Unadjusted Student Opportunity Costs			\$ 2,455.55	\$ 2,455.55	\$ 2,560.20	\$ 2,560.20	\$ 2,770,14	\$ 2,770.14
No. of 3rd and 4th Semes- ter Rank Enrollees	ı		× 11	× 10	× 10	ω ×	× 12	x 12
			\$27,011.05	\$24,555.50	\$25,602.00	\$20,481.60	\$33,241.68	\$33,241.68
Cost of Agri-Business Class Graduating:								
			\$123	\$123,046.01				
					\$138	\$138,633.48		
							\$190	\$190,141.02

\*The mean income male "ear round full-time workers completing 4 years of high school only and adjusted for labor force participation, unemployment, the time value of money, and reduced by expected summer earnings (10/52 of adjusted mean income of all male workers 18-24).



# TABLE 10

Societal Economic Cost of Financial Aid\* of Agri-Business Program Graduates By Semester, for Classes Graduating in 1971, 1972 and 1973

1973				1,574.88 \$1,000.00 \$1,000.00
1972				\$1,000.00
1972			\$ 200.00 \$ 200.00	1,574.88
1971			\$ 200.00	1,574.88
1971		978.01 \$ 978.01		
1970		\$ 978.01		
1970		\$ 250.00		
1969		\$ 250.00 \$ 250.00		
	Year of Graduation	1971	1972	1973

\*Financial aid excludes loans and work study, also it ignores any interest subsidy on the loans.



## EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION

To determine instructional equipment depreciation of equipment used in the Agri-Business Program shop and laboratory (Rooms W104 and M175) it is necessary first to obtain information as to (1) inventory (2) date of purchase (3) cost of equipment (4) economic life from an instructional point of view at time of purchase in semesters and (5) the percentage of the time the equipment is used by the Agri-Business Program. The basic model used to determine equipment depreciation costs is as follows:

$$\frac{h}{H}$$
  $\frac{C}{R}$  = E

### Where:

h = hours equipment is used in Agri-Business Program

H = total hours of equipment use

C = cost of equipment

E = semester equipment depreciation cost

Pages show an inventory of equipment used in the Agri-Business Program, date of purchase, cost, and estimated semester depreciation.

Page shows a breakdown of instructional equipment depreciation used in the Agri-Business Program by semester.



However, Agri-Business Program enrollees used more equipment than just that maintained in the Ag shop. Each course that they were required to take was given in a room that had some equipment in it, whether just a teacher's desk and lectern or several typewriters, etc. Even in those cases where the Agri-Business students did not use the equipment they must be charged with their proportionate share of the equipment depreciation since the holding of a class in that room prevented other simultaneous use of the equipment in the same room. To accomplish this it required an (1) inventory of equipment per room for each semester, 1969-1973, (2) cost of the equipment, (3) life expectancy of equipment at date of purchase, (4) percentage of time that the course occupies in that room. This resulted in the following formula:

 $\subset \frac{C}{R}$  = E and  $\frac{E}{N}$  = cost per enrollee

Where:

percentage of the time the room is used by the course, i.e. hours
per week course is taught in the room over total hours room is
used per week

C = cost of the equipment

R = economic life of the equipment in semesters at date of purchase from an instructional point of view

E = depreciated cost of equipment per course per semester

N = course enrollment

Since different sections of the same course could be taught in different rooms this factor was adjusted for also. (See Appendix time utilization schedules by course) Of course, this procedure would duplicate the results obtained from the first method in the Ag shop rooms.

Due to the lack of inventory data showing equipment per room by semester prior to June, 1974, I was forced to abandon the determination of instructional equipment in Agri-Business Program classes (except as determined through the first method). However, I did determine what equipment depreciation costs would



have been if all the equipment existing as of June 6, 1974 were on hand in the same rooms during every semester from 1969-1973 (See Appendix). Except for some rooms which were later converted to other uses (such as drafting) the equipment depreciation costs would have been minimal.

The Agri-Business Program students must also share part of the non-instructional equipment depreciation, i.e. equipment used for maintenance, administration, ancillary and professional, etc. Since accurate inventory data did not exist prior to June, 1974 I constructed a schedule (see following page) of non-instructional equipment for the years 1969-1974 by using the June, 1974 figure and adjusting for purchases and retirements (replacement purchases) data obtained through the audit reports for fiscal years 1969-1974. Next, (see schedule, page ) I prorated the Agri-Business Program share by multiplying the FTE percentage generated by the Agri-Business Program in each semester by the semester non-instructional equipment depreciation. (The semester equipment depreciation was based on average equipment on hand since I assumed that purchases occurred evenly throughout the fiscal year of acquisition) Note that the FTE percentages were adjusted to reflect appropriate enrollment in some semesters. A summary of both instructional and non-instructional equipment depreciation costs appear on the following pages.



e RIC			Est Purchase	Total Est	Est Instructional	er	% used by	Āġ
	<u>2ty</u>	Description	Date	Cost	: Life (in semester)	Sem	x Agri-Bus. =	Depreciation
	H	Air Compressor (Devilibuss Tan 50 50)	71	680	30	22.67	E . E E	7.55
	Н	Parts Washer (Gra Mills 300)	71	295	30	9.83	. 500	4.92
	7	Benches	70	300	30	10.00	1.00	10.00
	Н	Snap on Special Tool box w/large sockets	0.4.	100	30	3.33	1.00	3.33
	9	Snap on Tool boxes	7.0	641	30	21.36	1.00	21.36
	Н	Holgun 3/8" #643 B & D	7.0	64.30	30	2.14	1.00	2.14
	Н	Grinder #7307D Baldor 7" % Hp.	70	144:00	30	4.80	.750	3.60
	<del></del>	Parts Cleaner (used) Kota Division	7.1.	1500.00	30	50.00	.500	25.00
	Н	3/4 ton Walker Hoist #J816	71	409.00	30	13.63	1.00	13.63
<b>.</b>	Н	Bench Grinder 1/3 HP	7.1	95.00	30	3.17	1.00	3.17
	Н	4 ton Floor Jack #J134	7.1	270.00	30	00.6	1.00	00.6
•	Н	Rag Container 25-826	7.0	27.66	30	.92	1.00	.92
	ω	Jack stands J897	7.0	316.80	30	10.56	1.00	10.56
	н	Microfiche Reader	. 73	300.00	30	10.00	.500	5.00
	4	Cabinets homemade or free						
	Н	Drill Press	71	150,00	30	20.00	1.00	50.00
	Н	Vise	70	140.00	30	4.67	1.00	4.67
	Н	Visarecord	70	50.00	30	1.67	1.00	1.67

	y Adjusted Semester	2.17	22.80	3.33	204.83
	% used by Ax Agri-Bus. =	.500	1.00	1.00	
	Depr. Per Sem	4.33	22.80	3,33	258.27
TABLE 11, Cont.	Cost : Life (in semester) =	30	30	30	
TABLE	Total Est Cost	. 130	684	100	7,746.76
	Est Purchase Date	70	70		
	Description	8' Counter	Parts Cabinets	Miscellaneous Tools	TOTAL
E	ERIC	H	9		

Inventory Acquired (Calendar Year)

2,697.76	4,749.00	300.00
1970	1971	1973

Schedule of Agri-Business Program Estimated Equipment Depreciation by semester, assuming a 15 year Average Life, for the years 1969-1973.

	1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
Depreciation on acquisitions in:								
Spring 1970		\$44.96	\$44.96	\$ 44.96	\$ 44.96	\$ 44.96	\$ 44.96	\$ 44.96
Fall 1970			44.96	44.96	44.96	44.96	44.96	44.96
Spring 1971				79.15	79.15	79.15	79.15	79.15
Fall 1971					79.15	79.15	79.15	79.15
Spring 1973								5.00
Total Inde	Indeterminable \$4	\$44.96	\$89.92	\$169.07	\$248.22	\$248.22	\$248.22	\$253,22
Adjustment to reflect 2nd semester rank enrollees only		x56.25%						
Adjustment to reflect 3rd $\&$ 4th semester rank enrollees only	Ż:				,		x 35.29%	x 32.43%
G Total		\$25,29	\$89.92	\$169.07	\$248.22	\$248.22	\$ 87.60	\$ 82.12

Pre 1970 acquisitions are unknown. Acquisition date are estimates from Mr. Irving Rounsville, instructor in the Agri-Business Program. Purchases were assumed to occur evenly throughout the calendar year of acquisition. Note:

(3)	
ERIC	
Full Text Provided by ERIC	

								-	-									
1969-70													\$673752.06	7346.00	405.00	\$666811.06	\$670281.56	
1970-71										\$690499.07	18000.00	1252.99					\$682125.57	
1971-72							\$705799.62	18010.50	2709.95								\$698149.35	
1972-73				\$749619.45	44769.37	949.54	•										\$727709.54	
1973-74	\$789987.96	45657.22	5288.71														. \$769803.70	
<u>C</u>	Total 6/30/74 (est)	- Purchases	+ Replacement Purchases	Total 6/30/73	- Purchases	+ Replacement Purchases	Total 6/30/72	- Purchases	+ Replacement Purchases	Total 6/30/71	- Purchases	(1 + Replacement Purchases	Total 6/30/70	- Purchases	+ Replacement Purchases	Total 6/30/69	Average Equipment during yr. \$769803.70	

"Inventory Control Report; by room "Area Vocational Technical and Adult Education, District One & "Report on Statement of Cash Receipts & Expenditures" for fiscal years 1969-73, Area Vocational Technical & Adult Education, District One. The Bertleson Company Certified Public Accountants, Eau Claire. Sources:

4

TABLE 14

Schedule of Agri-Business Program's share of Estimated Non-instructional Equipment Depreciation by semester for the years 1969-1973.

	1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
Ave. Non-instructional Equipment (15 yrs x 2 = 30in semester)	\$670281.56 \$670281.56 \$682125.57 \$682125.57	\$670281.56	\$682125.57		\$698149.35	\$698149.35	\$698149.35 \$698149.35 \$727709.54 \$727709.54	\$727709.54
💠 Estimated Remaining Life	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Cost Per Semester	22342.72	22342.72	22737.52	22737.52	23271.65	23271.65	24256.98	24256.98
x FTE% in Agri-Business	x 2%	x 2.1%	x 2.3%	x 2.3%	x 2.2%	x 2.4%	x 2.4%	x 2.6%
Agri-Business Programs' share of Non-instructional Equipment Depreciation	446.85	469.20	522.96	522,96	511.98	558.52	582.17	630.68
Adjustment to reflect lst $\epsilon$ . 2nd rank only	× 52%	x 56.52%	a0					
Adjustment to reflect 3rd ε 4th rank only	1						×I	×
Chotals	\$ 232.36 \$	\$ 265.19 \$	\$ 522.96 \$	\$ 522.96 \$	\$ 511.98 \$	\$ 558.52 \$	\$ 205.50	\$ 204.53

Schedule of Agri-Business Program's Share of Non-instructional Equipment Depreciation & Estimated Agri-Business Program's Instructional Equipment Depreciation by semester for the years 1969-1973.

	ლ	41 vi	თ
1973	\$204.53	142,46	\$346.99
1972	\$205.50	139.63	\$345.13
1972	\$558.52	248.21	\$806.13
1971	\$511.98	248.21	\$760.19
1971	\$522.96	169.07	\$692.03
1970	\$522.96	89.92	\$612.88
, 1970	\$265.19	23.38	\$288.57
1969	\$232.36		\$232.36
	Non-Instructional Equipment Depreciation	Instructional Equipment Depreciation (used in Agri- Business program)	Total

### BUILDING DEPRECIATION

To determine the Agri-Business Program's share of instructional rooms building depreciation, I used the following formula:

$$\propto$$
 S  $\frac{B}{R}$  = E and  $\frac{E}{N}$  = cost per enrollee

### Where:

- the percentage of time the room is used by the course, i.e. hours course is taught in room during week over total hours the room is used
- S = percentage of space utilized, i.e. space in room the course is taught in over total space in building
- B = cost of building plus remodeling since construction
- R = economic life of building
- E = semester depreciation
- N = enrollment in course

A space utilization schedule of rooms used each semester was prepared (see Appendix). Also a time utilization schedule was prepared (see Appendix). A 50-year life (100 semesters) was estimated for the building. A depreciation schedule which reflects both original construction, building, additions, and remodeling costs appears on the following page.



TABLE 15

Depreciation Schedule by semester for the main building, assuming a 50 year life,--District One Technical Institute is the years 1969-1973.

1972 1973	\$ 3859.94 \$ 3859.94	35000.00 35000.00	32.26 32.26	312.05 312.05	308.25 308.25	173.73 173.73	\$39686.23 \$39686.23
1972	\$ 3859.94	35000.00	32.26	312.05	308.25		\$39512.50
1971	\$ 3859.94	35000.00	32.26	312.05	308.25		\$39512.50
1971	\$ 3859.94	35000.00	32.26	312.05			\$39204.25
1970	\$ 3859.94	35000.00	32.26	312.05			\$39204.25
1970	\$ 3859.94	35000.00	32.26				\$38892.20
1969	\$ 3859.94	35000.00	32.26				\$38892.20
	Original Bldg. (1961)	Addition (1967)	Remodeling 1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	rotal

(M) Iso "Report on Statement of Cash Receipts and Expenditures with Supplementary Data" for Fiscal Years 1969-1973 Area Vocational Technical and Adult Education District One, The Bertleson Company Certified Public Accountants, Opource: Mr. Norbert K. Wurtzel, Assistant Director-Administrative Services, District One Technical Institute. Eau Claire, WI. Next, following the above formula instructional rooms building depreciation costs were computed for each course and each semester from 1969-1973 (see Appendix). From this data, Table 16, which shows instructional rooms building depreciation costs by semester rank, was prepared.

In order to determine non-instructional building depreciation costs, first I had to subtract instructional space from total building space and divide by total space to obtain the percentage of the building space used for non-instructional purposes. Next I multiplied the non-instructional space percentage by total semester building depreciation to arrive at total non-instructional building depreciation. To determine the Agri-Business Program's share of semester non-instructional depreciation I multiplied total semester non-instructional building depreciation by the percentage of total school FTE's generated by the Agri-Business Program enrollees and adjusted where necessary.

The formula used:

$$f \quad \frac{S - I}{S} \quad \frac{B}{R} = N$$

Where:

f = FTE% generated by Agri-Business Program enrollees

S = total space in building

I = total space used for instructional purposes

B = cost of the building plus remodeling

R = estimated economic life of the building

N = Agri-Business Program's share of the semester cost of noninstructional building depreciation

A summary of instructional and non-instructional building depreciation costs appear on the following page.



Instructional Building Depreciation Costs for Agri-Business Program Enrollees, . By Semester Rank, for the Years 1969-1973

1973	
1972	
1972	
1971	
1971	
1970	• •
1970	
1969	u H

Instructional Costs:

				\$47.40			\$1117.62
			\$64.44				
	,	\$429.03		\$46.32		\$1029.43	
	\$576.75		\$50.30				
/		\$579.03		\$70.80	\$458.95		
·	\$353.78		\$39.49	.: •			
		\$272.22					
. /	\$76.44						
Semester Rank	lst	2nd	3rd	4th	1971 Class	1972 Class	1973 Class

1973 Class

46

Agri-Business Program's share of Main Building Depreciation Costs for Administration, Ancillary & other Non-Instructional Cost Categories by semester for the years 1960-1973.

	1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
Total Depr.	\$38892.20	\$38892.20	\$39204.25	\$39204.25	\$39512.50	\$39512.50	\$39686.23	\$39686.23
% age space used for non- instructional purposes	x 53.8%	x 53.8%	x 53.8%	x 53.8%	x 53.8%	x 53.8%	x 53.8%	x 53.8%
Total non-instructional Depr.	\$20924.00	\$20924.00	\$21091.89	\$21091.81	\$21257.73	\$21257.73	\$21351.19	\$21351.19
FTE & of Agri-Business Enrollees	x 1.04%	x 1.12%	x 2.3%	x 2.3%	x 2.2%	x 2.48	x .85%	x .84%
Total non-instructional Depr. associated with Agri-Business Program	\$ 217.61 \$ 234.35	\$ 234.35	\$ 485.11	\$ 485.11	\$ 467.67	\$ 510.19	\$ 467.67 \$ 510.19 \$ 181.49 \$ 179.35	\$ 179.35

Instructional & non-instructional Building Depreciation Costs by semester for the Agri-Business Program for the years 1969-1973. Summary Table of:

. \$	1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973	
Non-Instructional Depr.	\$217.61	\$234.35	\$485.11	\$485.11 \$ 485.11 \$ 467.67	\$ 467.67	\$510.19	\$181.49	\$179.35	
Instructional Depr.:									
l & 2 Semester Rank	76.44	272.22	353.78	579.03	576.75	429.03			
3 & 4 Semester Rank			39.49	70.80	50.30	46.32	64.44	47.40	
Total	\$294.05	\$506.57	\$878.38	\$1134.94	\$1094.72	\$985.54	\$245.93	\$226.75	

FTE%'s were adjusted (to 52% and 56.25% respectively of original totals) in 1969-70 semesters in order to reflect costs associated with 1st and 2nd semester rank enrollees only. FTE%'s were adjusted (to 35.29% and 32.43% respectively of original totals) in 1972-73 semesters in order to reflect costs associated with 3rd and 4th semester rank enrollees only. Note:

TABLE 17

Schedule of Total FTE's in Agribusiness Program by semester for the years (Fall) 1969-1973 (Spring).\*

lst Semester (Fall)	1969	1970	1971	1972	<u>1973</u>
Total FTE	1377	1466	1693	1906	
Agribusiness FTE	27.40	.33.47	37.13	47.47	
% in Agribusiness	2%	2.3%	2.2%	2.5%	
2nd Semester (Spring)					
Total FTE		1214	1408	1583	1762
Agribusiness FTE		25.07	32.60	38.73	46.40
% in Agribusiness		2.1%	2.3%	2.4%	2.6%

Schedule of Total FTE's in Agribusiness Program for Summer Session for the years 1969-1972 (FTE's).\*

	1969	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	1972
Total Agribusiness	111.53	112.17	123.23	179.76
AGLIDUSINESS	.93	.60	.35	1.20

<sup>\*</sup>Data obtained from Mr. Norbert Wurtzel, Assistant Director-Administrative Services, of the Area Vocational Technical and Adult Education District One.



Table 17 shows the FTE's generated by Agri-Business Program enrollees for each semester for the years 1969-1973. The schedule that follows it shows total FTE's generated by the Agri-Business Program enrollees during the summers of 1969-1972. Based on the minimal amounts generated by the program and in total during the summer relative to the spring and fall semesters, I assumed that all cash expenditures for categories 6-15 were incurred evenly between the fall and spring semesters

It should be noted that District One Technical Institute employs the cash basis method of accounting. Consequently, book expenses and revenues may be either under or overstated for any given year when compared with results under accrual basis of accounting. However, the effect of an understatement (overstatement) of expenses in any one year is offset by overstatement (understatement) of expenses the following year when the expense is paid (incurred). Ancillary and Professional General Formula:

$$f \qquad \frac{A - \left[ (P + T + S) \right]}{2} \qquad + \quad \infty C = AP$$

Where:

f = percentage FTE's generated by Agri-Business Program enrollees

A = total ancillary and professional cash expenditures as per audit
report

P = professional salaries full-time program

T = total coordinators salaries - other programs

S = supervisors - other programs costs

percentage of time spent by coordinator on the Agri-Business
Program

C = Agri-Business Program Coordinator total salary adjusted for fringe benefits

AP = adjusted ancillary and professional cash expenditures

Using this formula ancillary and professional costs were computed (see following page) on a semester basis.



49

Debt Service General Formula:

$$f \quad \boxed{\boxed{D - P}} = DS$$

Where:

f = percentage of FTE's generated by Agri-Business Program enrollees

D = total debt repayment intere tand principal

P = repayment of principal

DS = adjusted debt service and cash expenditure

In order to conform to generally accepted accounting theory, the debt services cash expenditures was reduced by repayments of principal. This was necessary as repayment of principal is never considered an expense. Table 19 shows the adjustment of the Debt Service Account.



TAE

Ancillary and Professional Cash Expenditures As Adjusted to Exclude Non-Agri-Business Program Coordinators Salaries-Fullary and Professional Cash Expenditures As Adjusted to Exclude Non-Agri-Business Programs Costs
Full-Time Programs, Total Coordinators-Other Programs, Supervisors-Other Programs Costs

	00.1	93	. 29	873.00 x 2.6%	74	98.
1973	\$439.745.00	\$ 53,441.93 83,129.18 9,301.18	\$145,872.29	\$293,873.00 x 2.6%	7,640.74	9,795.86
					\$ 7 \$ 2	\$ 7
1972	\$439,745.00	\$ 53,441.93 83,129.18 9,301.18	\$145,872.29	\$293,873.00 x 2.4%	7,052.95	\$ 9,208.07
13	\$439,	\$ 53,	\$145,	\$293,	\$ 7,	, 6 \$
÷	00.6	1.53	3.48	386.00 x 2.4%	7.26	3.47
1972	\$339,319.00	\$ 58,761.53 66,904.82 6,262.13	\$131,933.48	\$207,386.00 x 2.4%	4,977.26	\$ 7,048.47
					ا ي	
<u> </u>	319.00	58,761.53 66,904.82 6,262.13	33.48	386.00 x 2.2%	4,562.49	6,633.70
1971	\$339,319.00	\$ 58,761.53 66,904.82 6,262.13	\$131,933.48	\$207,386.00 x 2.2%	\$ 4,5	\$ 6,6
1971	\$268,944.85	\$ 42,263.63 59,990.43 3,568.13	\$105,822.19	\$163,121.81 x 2.3%	3,751.80	5,662.52
٦١	\$268	\$ 42 59	\$105	\$163	ۍ <del>۱</del>	رب رب
	4.85	,263.63 ,990.43	,822.19	121.81 x 2.3%	,751.80	,662.52
1970	68,94	\$ 42,263.63 59,990.43 3,568.13	05,82	\$163,121.81 x 2.3%	3,75	5,66
	\$2(		\$105		က ၊	٠
ol	\$181,629.57 \$268,944.85	\$ 23,716.95 30,892.48 3,846.10	\$ 58,455.53	\$123,174.04 x 2.18	2,586.66	\$ 4,322.83
1970	181,6	23,7 30,8 3,8	58,4	123,1		4,3
					48 \$	
1969	\$181,629.57	\$ 23,716.95 30,892.48 3,846.10	\$ 58,455.53	\$123,174.04 x 2%	\$ 2,463.48	.209.
51	\$181,	\$ 23,	\$ 58'	\$123,	\$ 2,	ې 4
	j.)	e e		-Bs)	*1	Bs.)
	re ad	alari oord. sion		Agri	oord.	(Agr-
	(befo	Prof. Salar Total Coord Supervision		ENCE % in	ıs. C	A የ የ
	A & P (before adj.)	Less: (1) Prof. Salaries (2) Total Coord. (3) Supervision	TOTAL	DIFFERENCE X (FTE % in Agri-Bs)	TOTAL Agri-Bus. Coord.*l	TOTAL A&P (Agr-Bs.) \$ 4,209.65
	Æ	ă u u u	Ĭ	Д×	Ĭ Ă	Ĭ

on Statement of Cash Receipts and Expenditures with Supplementary Data", The Bertleson Data was obtained from Area Vocational, Technical and Adult Education District One. Company, CPA's, FY 1969-1973. \*lAccording to Henry Schank, Accountant of District One VTAE, the Agri-Business Coordinator's salary was as follows:

	1969-70	1970-71	1971–72	1972-73
Coordinator's Base Salary Fringe Benefits (est.) Salary with fringes Coordination Time on Ag Program	\$12,472.62 x 112% \$13,969.33 x 25% \$ 3,492.33	\$13,291.95 x 115% \$15,285.74 x 25% \$ 3,821.44	\$14,042,10	\$14,367.42 x 120% \$17,240.90 x 25% \$ 4,310.23

Showing Adjustment of Debt Service Account
To Exclude Repayment of Principal for the Fiscal Year 1969-1973

TABLE 19

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73
Before adj.	\$270,285.08	\$354,026.29	\$346,206.82	\$349,056.44
Less Principal Repay.	145,000.00	175,000.00	175,000.00	178,043.01
Adjusted	\$125,285.08	\$179,026.29	\$171,206.82	\$171,013.43
÷ 2	62,642.54	89,513.15	85,603.41	85,506.72
X FTE % 1st Sem.	x 2.0%	x 2.3%	x 2.2%	x 2.4%
Adj. Agri-Bus.	\$ 1,252.85	\$ 2,058.80	\$ 1,883.28	\$ 2,052.16
2nd Sem.	62,642.54	89,513.15	85,603.41	85,506.72
FTE Agri-Bus.	_x 2.1%	x 2.3%	x 2.4%	x 2.6%
Adj. Agri-Bus.	\$ 1,315.49	\$ 2,058.80	\$ 2,054.48	\$ 2,223.17

Data obtained from Area Vocational, Technical and Adult Education District One, "Report on Statement of Cash Receipts and Expenditures with Supplementary Data", FY 1969-1973, The Bertleson Company, Certified Public Accountant, Eau Claire, Wisconsin.



To compute administration at the local level, operation and maintenance, transportation, fixed charges, transfers to clearing accounts, outgoing transfers account, school sales (net expenditures), and food services (net receipts or net expenditures), cash expenditures the following formula was used:

f (\$AM + \$OM + \$TP + \$FC + \$TC + \$OT + \$SS + \$FS) = Agri-Business Program share of the semester cost

### Where:

f = percentage of FTE's generated by Agri-Business Program enrollees

AM = administration cash expenditures

OM = operation and maintenance cash expenditures

TP = transportation cash expenditures

FC = fixed charges

TC = transfers to clearing accounts

OT = outgoing transfer account

SS = school sales net expenditures

FS = food service net receipts or net expenditures

A schedule of computations which appears on the following page shows the Agri-Business Program's share of the above costs. Again, note the totals were adjusted in some semesters. A summary table of these costs by semester is presented on page .



Ovided by ERIC		1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
(1)	Administration x FTE% in Agri-Business Administration Cost	\$65267.94 x 2% \$ 1305.36	\$65267.94 x 2.1% \$ 1370.63	\$61392.38 x 2.3% \$ 1412.03	\$61392.38 x 2.3% \$ 1412.03	\$82251,86 x 2.2% \$ 1809.54	\$82251.86 x 2.4% \$ 1974.05	\$94669.79 x 2.4% \$ 2272.08	\$94699.79 x 2.6% \$ 2461.42
(2)	Ancillary & Professional (Adj) x FTE% in Agri-Business	\$123174.04 x 2% \$ 2463.48	\$123174.04 x 2.1% \$ 2586.66	\$163121.81 x 2.3% \$ 3751.80	\$163121.81 x 2.3* \$ 3751.80	\$207386.00 x 2.2* \$ 4562.45	\$207386.00 x 2.4% \$ 4977.26	\$293873.00 x 2.4% \$ 7052.95	\$293873.00 x 2.6% \$ 7640.74
	+ Agri-Business Coordin- ator's salary, Ancillary & Professional Cost	1746.17 \$ 4209.65	1746.17 \$ 4322.83	1910.72	1910.72	2071.21 \$ 6633.70	2071.21 \$ 7048.47	2155.12 \$ 9208.07	2155.12 \$ 9795.80
(3)	Operation & Maintenance of Plant	\$115501.88	\$115501.88	\$141739.27	\$141739.27	\$144583.44	\$144583.44	\$166560.49	\$166560.49
<b>,</b>	x FTE% in Agri-Business O & M of Plant Cost	x 2% \$ 2310.04	x 2.1% \$ 2362.54	x 2.3% \$ 3260.00	x 2.3% \$ 3260.00	x 2.2% \$ 3180.84	x 2.4% \$ 3470.00	x 2.4% \$ 3997.45	x 2.6% \$ 4330.57
. <b>6</b> 8	Transportation x FTE% in Agri-Business Transportation Cost	\$1028.80 x 2% \$ 20.58	\$1028.80	\$ 965.20 x 2.3% \$ 22.20	\$ 965.20 x 2.3% \$ 22.20	\$2754.86 <b>x</b> 2.2% \$ 60.61	\$2754.86 x 2.48 \$ 66.12	\$2331.63 x 2.4% \$ 55.96	\$2331.63 x 2.6% \$ 60.62
$\sim$	5) Fixed Charges x FTE% in Agri-Business Fixed Charges Cost	\$97357.38 x 2% \$ 1947.15	\$97357.38 x 2.1% \$ 2044.51	\$60760.00 x 2.3% \$ 1397.48	\$60760.00 x 2.3% \$ 1397.48	\$104346.02 x 2.2% \$ 2295.61	\$104346.02 x 2.48 \$ 2295.61	\$161399.54 x 2.4% \$ 3873.59	\$161399.54 x 2.6% \$ 4196.39
(9)		\$6340.31	\$6340.31	\$5637.31	\$5637.31	\$12234.76	\$12234.76	\$19289.13	\$19289.13
	Acces x FTE% in Agri-Business T.C.A. Cost	x 2% \$ 126.81	x 2.1% \$ 133.15	x 2,3% \$ 129.66	x 2.3% \$ 129.66	x 2.2% \$ 269.17	x 2.4% \$ 293.63	x 2.4% \$ 462.94	x 2.6% \$ 501.52
(7)	Outgoing Transfer Acct x FTE% in Agri-Business O.T.A. Cost	\$20634.71 x 2% \$ 412.69	\$20634.71 x 2.1% \$ 433.33	\$11033.67 x 2.3% \$ 253.77	\$11033.67 x 2.3% \$ 253.77	\$28278.92 x 2.2% \$ 622.14	\$28278.92 x 2.48 \$ 678.69	\$37235.44 x 2.48 \$ 893.65	\$37235.44 x 2.68 \$ 968.12
(8)	Debt Service (Adj) % FTE% in Agri-Business Debt Service Cost	\$62642.54 x 2% \$1252.85	\$62642.54 x 2.1% \$1315.49	\$89513.15 x 2.3% \$2058.80	\$89513.15 x 2.3% \$2058.80	\$85603.41 x 2.2% \$1883.28	\$85603.41 x 2.4% \$2054.48	\$85506.72 x 2.4% \$2052.16	\$85506.72 x 2.6% \$2223.17

			:	100 /00	• 1				
ER		1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
66 UC WHARST PERIC	School Sales (Net Expenditures)	\$5854.03	\$5854.03	\$1850.42	\$1850.42	\$4564.98	\$4564.98	\$11591.91	\$11591.91
	x FTE% in Agri-Business	x 2%	x 2.1%	x 2.3%	x 2.3%	x 2.2%	x 2.48	x 2.4%	x 2.6%
	SCHOOL SALES COST	80°/TT &	46.221 ¢	\$	00°•24		) ) ) )	1 0	1
(10)	Food Service (Net	\$728.65	\$728.65	\$2924.11	\$2924.11	\$2514.27	\$2514.27	\$4984.46	\$4984.46
	x FTE% in Agri-Business	x 2%	x 2.1%	x 2.3%	x 2.3%	x 2.2%	x 2.48	x 2.4%	x 2.6%
	Food Service Cost (or	(\$ 14.57)	(\$ 12.30)	(\$ 67.26)	(\$ 67.26)	(\$ 55.31)	(\$ 60.34)	\$ TT9.63	9 TS9.60

Receipts)

54

Summary Table of Administrative, Ancillary & Professional Cash Expenditures et al (also at local level) by semester for the Agri-Business Program for the years 1969-1973.

		1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
(1)	Administration	\$ 1305.36	\$ 1370.63	\$ 1412.03	\$ 1412.03	\$ 1809.54	\$ 1974.05	\$ 2272.08	\$ 2461.42
(2)	Adj. A & P	4209.65	4322.03	5622,52	5662.52	6633.70	7048.47	9208.07	9795.83
(3)	Oper. & Maint.	2310.04	2362.54	. 3260,00	3260.00	3180.84	3470.00	3997.45	4330.57
(4)	Transp.	20.58	21.61	22.20	22.20	60.61	66.12	55.96	60.62
(2)	Fixed Charges	1947.15	2044.51	1397.48	1397.48	2295.61	2504.30	3873.59	4196.39
(9)	Trsfrs to Cleaning Acct.	126.81	133.15	129.66	129.66	269.17	293.63	462.94	501.52
(7)	Acct. Outgoing Trsfr Acct.	412.69	433.33	253.77	253.77	622.14	678.69	893.65	968.12
(8)	Debt Svc.	1252.85	1315.49	2058.80	2058.80	1883.28	2054.48	2052.16	2223.17
© 7 <b>0</b>	School Sales	117.08	122.94	42.56	42.56	100.43	109.56	278.21	301.39
+(10)	Net Expenditures Food Svc.			·				119.63	129.60
-(10)	Ne	14.57	15.30	67.26	67.26	55.31	60,34		
	rood svc.	\$11687.64		\$14131.76	\$14131.76	\$16800.01	\$18138.96	\$23213.75	\$24968.63
Adj. 2n	Adj. to reflect only 1st & 2nd semester rank students	X 52%	X 56,52%			·			
Adj. 4t	Adj. to reflect only 3rd & 4th semester rank students							X 35.29%	X 32.43%
TOTALS	ST	\$ 6077.57	\$ 6845.55	\$14131,76	\$14131.76	\$16800.01	\$18138.96	\$ 8192.13	\$ 8097.33

### STATE ADMINISTRATION

The calculation of the Agri-Business Program's share of state VTAE administration costs entailed the following: first, obtaining total FTE's generated in the state and second, the Agri-Business Program's share of FTE's generated (See Table 22). Next, the total state VTAE administration costs were obtained and reduced by an adjustment to eliminate administration costs associated with MDTA and Adult Education Programs. Further it reduced to 80 percent the previous difference in order to show administration costs of full-time programs. Table 23A shows the calculations described above that were necessary to arrive at the Agri-Business Program's share of state administration costs. Table 23B is a summary of societal economic costs per Agri-Business class excluding student opportunity costs.



### TABLE 22

Schedule of FTE's in District One VTAE Agri-Pusiness Program and Total FTE's Generated in the State of Wisconsin's Post Secondary Vocational Schools for the Years  $1969-1973*^3$ 

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
lst Semester (Fall)					
Agri-Business* <sup>1</sup> Total FTE's * <sup>2</sup> % FTE in Agri	27.40 23548 .11636%	33.47 26444 .12657%	37.13 31345 .11846%	47.47 43925 .10807%	
2nd Semester (Spring)					
Agri-Business Total FTE's % FTE in Agri-Bus.		25.07 23548 .10646%	32.60 26444 .12328%	38.73 31345 .12356%	46.40 43925 .10563%

### Sources:



<sup>\*1</sup> Mr. Norbert Wurtzel, Assistant Director for Administrative Services, District One VTAE Institute

<sup>\*2&</sup>quot;Full-Time Post-Secondary Enrollments for Fall Semester of the Years 1969-71", Wisconsin System of VTAE for the 1972-73 FY; "Total FTE's Generated by the VTAE Districts, FY 1972-73". Both were obtained from Mr. Wayne R. Atkins, Assistant Director for Research and Planning of District One VTAE.

<sup>\*3(</sup>Assumption that fall semester FTE's = Spring FTE's)

# TABLE 23A

Schedule of Agri-Business Program Share of State VTAE Board Administration Costs
As Adjusted for the Years 1969-1973

	1969	1970	1970	1971
State Admin. Costs*1  X % FTE in Agri over Total FTE's  Cost Per Semester	. \$376,105.60 <u>.06050%</u> X \$227.57	\$376,105.60 .070689% X \$265.87	\$419,263.60 	\$419,263.60 .12328% \$516.87
	1971	1972	1972	1973
State Admin. Costs* <sup>l</sup>	\$576,640.00	\$576,640.00	\$726,720.00	\$726,720.00
X % FTE in Agri over Total FTE's	X <u>.11846</u> %	.12356% X	04360% X	,03426%
Cost Per Semester	\$683.09	\$712.50	\$316.88	\$248.95

\*lAdministrative Costs were obtained from Gerald Lindas, Fiscal Supervisor, Wisconsin Board VTAE. These costs were determined by taking total administrative costs for each fiscal year given below and subtracting \$150,000 from each total, this amount representing MDTA and Adult Education Management. This difference was then multiplied by 80%, the percentage of administrative funds spent on full-time programs.

FY	1969-70	<u>1970-71</u>	1971-72	1972-73
MDTA & AE		\$1,198,159 -150,000 \$1,048,159.00 <u>* 80%</u>	\$1,589,100 -150,000 \$1,439,100 x 80%	\$1,966,800 -150,000 \$1,816,800 x 80%
÷ 2 Per Sem.	\$ 752,211.20 \$ 376,105.60	\$ 838,527.20 \$ 419,263.60	\$1,151,280 \$ 575,640	\$1,453,440 \$ 726,720

Note: FTE%'s were adjusted (to 52% and 56.25% of original totals) in 1969-70 semesters in order to reflect costs associated with 1st and 2nd semester rank enrollees only. FTE percent's were adjusted (to 35.29% and 32.43% of original totals) in 1972-73 semesters in order to reflect costs associated with 3rd and 4th semester rank enrollees only.



# SOCIETAL ECONOMIC COSTS\* ADJUSTED FOR THE TIME VALUE OF MONEY\*\*, BY SEMESTER, FOR THE AGRI-BUSINESS PROGRAM FOR THE YEARS 1969-1973

	1969	1970	1970	1971	1971	1972	1972	1973
Adjusted**:	***************************************							
Costs associated with lst & 2nd semester rank enrollees	\$11,66	\$12,491.90	\$15,768.15	\$16,439.94	\$23,192.05	\$22,808.87		
Unadjusted:								
Costs associated with 3rd & 4th semester rank enrollees			9,856.20	9,444.66	9,114.91	8,982.33	\$12,706.49	\$12,573.88
Cost for classes graduating in:								
1971 1972				43,457.17		50,305.33		
1973								71,281.29
	, *Tvoliding student oppostunity costs	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ŭ					

\*Excluding student opportunity costs

\*\*A 5% rate was used

CHAPTER THREE

PRIVATE AND SOCIETAL ECONOMIC BENEFITS



### SOCIETAL ECONOMIC BENEFITS AND PRIVATE ECONOMIC BENEFITS

As explained earlier, societal economic benefits differ from private economic benefits only in that the former are computed gross of income taxes while
the latter are net of such taxes. In this section of the report I attempt to
determine societal economic benefits and private economic benefits and then
finally combine societal economic benefits with societal economic costs and
private economic benefits with private economic costs to determine benefit cost
ratios.

The average monthly salary Agri-Business Program enrollees could expect to earn six to nine months after graduation varied from \$506 in 1971 to \$536 in 1973 (See Table 24). The average weekly hours they could expect to work, which showed a marked downward trend, varied from 55 hours in 1971 to 44 hours in 1973. (See Table 24)

Wages are essentially a function of the wage per hour and the number of hours worked per week. In order to compare the earnings of an Agri-Business graduate to that of a high school graduate, it is necessary to deflate the earnings of the Agri-Business graduate to account for the difference in earnings due to the additional hours worked. Two assumptions were made concerning the base weekly hours to use. Under the first assumption (Case 1) the average weekly hours of production and nonsupervisory workers on non-agricultural payrolls were assumed to approximate those worked by the high school graduate. Under the second assumption (Case 2) average full-time hours were assumed to be 40 hours per week. Table 25A shows estimated deflators using both methods. Table 25B shows deflated average monthly salaries for Agri-Business Program classes graduating in 1971, 1972 and 1973. 1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>It should be noted that average monthly earnings do not reflect any overtime premium earned, consequently it was not necessary to adjust the deflators for overtime premiums.



An argument against the use of deflators is that high school as well as technical institute graduates would like to work overtime in order to make more money. Thus; (1) the opportunity to work overtime is a benefit desired by workers at that end of the pay scale, and (2) high school graduates do not have that opportunity. Consequently, deflators should not be used.

While I cannot agree with the argument to exclude deflators, I would agree that the ability to work full-time is a definite advantage over being able to work part-time only. Therefore, if the mean income of all males workers reflects less than full-time hours worked (i.e. average weekly hours worked of all workers are less than full-time) it would not be necessary to deflate the earnings of the Agri-Business Program graduates beyond full-time.



TABLE 24

Average Salary per Month and Average Hours Worked Weekly of Technical Institute Agri-Business Program Graduates, for the Years 1971-1973\*

Monthly Salary:	1971	1972	1973
Range	324.75 <b>-</b> 588.85* <sup>1</sup>	473-600	300-752
Average	506.43* <sup>3</sup>	521	536 <b>≭</b> <sup>2</sup>
Hours Worked Weekly			•
Average	55	49	44

<sup>\*</sup>See follow-up studies for 1971, 1972, 1973.



<sup>\*1</sup>Statistics for 1971 were given on a weekly basis. They were adjusted by multiplying the weekly figure by 4.33(52) the average number of weeks in a month.

<sup>\*2</sup>Shows only those employed in job related fields. Those employed outside field of training - their salaries are not substantially different.

<sup>\*&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Estimated average monthly salary range only was given in follow-up study for 1971. A growth rate of 2.88% was assumed (the 2.88% is the growth rate for 1972-73).

TABLE 25A

Average Weekly Hours of Technical Institute Agri-Business Program

Graduates for 1971-1973 and Estimated Deflators

	1971	1972	1973
Average Weekly Hours*1	55	49	44
Case 1 High School Graduates Wkly hrs*2	37	37.2	37.1
Case 2 High School Graduates Wkly hrs*3	40	40	40
Deflators Case 1	1.487	1.317	1.186
Deflators Case 2	1.375	1.225	1.10

<sup>\*1</sup>Follow-up studies for 1971, 1972, 1973.

TABLE 25B

Deflator Adjusted Earnings of Technical Institute
Agri-Business Program Graduates for 1971-1973

	1971	1972	1973
Average Monthly Earnings before adjustment*1	506.42	521	536
Deflator Case 1	1.487	1.317	1.186
Adjusted Earnings	340.56	395.60	451.93
Average Monthly Earnings before adjustment	506.42	521	536
Deflator Case 2	1.375	1.225	1.10
Adjusted Earnings	368.31	425.31	487.27

 $<sup>^{*1}</sup>$ See follow-up studies for 1971, 1972, 1973.



<sup>\*2</sup>Gross Average hours & earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls Monthly Labor Review 1974.

<sup>\*3</sup> Assumes high school graduates work 40 hours per week.

 $<sup>^{*4}</sup>$ Deflators adjust for differences in earnings due to additional hours worked.

<sup>\*2</sup>See table of Deflators above.

Table 26 shows the monetary growth rates in starting salaries (six to nine months on the job) of Agri-Business Program graduates and the rate of inflation during the same period.

TABLE 26

Growth Rates in Starting Salaries of Agri-Business Program
Graduates of Classes Graduating in 1971-1973

	1971		1972		1973
Salary (Unadjusted average monthly salary)	\$506.42		\$521.00		\$536.00
Growth Rate		2.88%		2.88%	
Salary (Adjusted for Deflator 1)  Growth Rate	340.56	16%	395.60	14%	451.93
Salary (Adjusted for Deflator 2)	368.31		425.31		487.27
Growth Rate		15.5%		14.5%	
Inflation Rate		3.3%		6.2%	

The reason for the tremendous difference between unadjusted average salary growth rates and deflator adjusted average salary growth rates, is the increase in salary that results from shorter hours worked per week and increasing starting salary. Working hours per week were 55 in 1971 and had declinded to 49 in 1972 and 44 in 1973.

Schedule of Consumer Price Index and Purchasing Power of the 1967-72 Consumer Dollar\*

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Consumer Price Index	100	104.2	109.8	116.3	126.3	125.3
Purchasing Power	1.000	.960	.911	.860	.824	.799

<sup>\*</sup>Table G5 "Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers for Selected Groups and Purchasing Power of the Consumer Dollar" Manpower Report of the President 1973.



Table 27 shows the real (inflation adjusted) growth rates in starting salaries when using deflators and not. The average real growth rate for the three year period under either deflator method is about 10 percent. It is probably reasonable to assume that all levels of machinery partsman-salesman positions advanced in pay as the starting level earnings rose. This condition usually exists as higher level (and paid) workers react to maintain the gap in pay that separates them from starting level workers. Due to this reason, data limitations on graduates' earnings, and a time horizon that was extremely short, five years; I assumed a 10 percent growth rate.

TABLE 27
Real Growth Rates in Starting Salaries of Agri-Business Program
Graduates of Classes Graduating in 1971-1973

	1971	1972	1973
Growth Rate (Unadjusted Salary)	2.88%	2.88%	
Inflation Rate	3.30%	6.20%	
Real Growth Rate	-1.42%	<b>-</b> 3.32%	
Growth Rate (Deflator 1)	16.0%	14.0%	
Inflation Rate	3.3%	6.2%	
Real Growth Rate	12.7%	7.8%	
Growth Rate (Deflator 2)	15.5%	14.5%	
Inflation Rate	3.3%	6.2%	-
Real Growth Rate	11.2%	8.3%	

Correspondingly, Table 28 shows the real growth rate in mean income of male year round full-time workers, for a six-year period. It should be noted it has averaged only about two percent during that period. This rate was employed to project future mean income of male year round full-time workers.



Full-Time Workers Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School Completed for the Years 1967-1972 TABLE 28
Real Growth Rates in Mean Annual Income in Current Dollars of Male Year Round

	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
Mean Annual Income*1	\$5091.00	\$5438.00	\$6157.00	\$6493.00	\$6393.00	\$6927.00
Growth Rate	88*9		13.2% 5.	5.5% -1.6%		8.4%
Inflation Rate*2	4.2%	,	5.4% 5.	5.9% 4.	4.3% 3.	3.3%
Real Growth Rate	+2.6%	·	+7.8%	4%5.9%	98 +5.18	1%
1967-72 Average Real Growth Rate .	+1.8%	3%				

\*1"Table 5 Mean Income in 1967 to 1972 of Male Year Round Full-Time Workers, by selected Age Group and years of Income, Lifetime Income, and Educational Attainment of Men in the United States, for selected years, 1956 to school completed" U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60 No. 92, "Annual Mean 1972," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 1974.

Monthly Labor Review, \*2"Table 25 Consumer and Wholesale Price Indexes, annual averages and changes, 1951-73". U.S. Department of Labor U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC April, 1974. Table 29 shows the real growth rate of all male workers 18-24. The average real growth rate during the six year period was approximately two percent. This rate was employed to project the future mean income of all male workers.



Of Men Age 18-24 with 4 Years of High School Completed for the Years 1967-1972 TABLE 29
Real Growth Rates in Mean Annual Income, In Current Dollars

	1967	1968		1969	1970	1971	1972	
Mean Annual Income*1	\$3491.00	\$3674.00		\$3989.00	\$4172.00	\$4195.00	\$4837.00	
Growth Rate	Ŋ	5.2%	8.6%	4.6%	%	% 9•	15.3%	
Infiation Rate*2	41	4.2%	5.4%	5.9%	w [	4.3%	3.3%	
Real Growth Rate	Т	7%	3.2%	-1.3%		-3.7%	12.0%	
1967-72 Average Real Growth Rate	N	2.2%						

Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60 No. 92, "Annual Mean Income, Lifetime Income, and Educational Attain-\*Trable 2 Mean Income in 1956 to 1972 of men, by selected age group and years of school completed. U.S. Bureau of that ment of Men in the United States, for selected years, 1956 to 1972," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 1974.

U.S. Department of Commerce \*273.\* Table 25 Consumer and Wholesale Price Indexes, annual averages and changes, 1951-73. "Monthly Labor Review" U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC April, 1974. In order to compute the earnings an Agri-Business Program graduate could expect; future earnings must be: (1) increased by the anticipated growth rate (as determined above); (2) adjusted for the probability of labor force participation by the graduate; and (3) the probability of the Agri-Business Program graduate's employment. Table 30 shows actual and projected labor force participation and unemployment rates for Agri-Business Program graduates, assuming a five year time horizon.



$\frac{2}{\text{UN}}$				9.1%	
1977 LFPR U				94.3% 9.1% 94.3% 9.1%	
ND GN			9.1%	9.1%	
1976 LFPR			94.3% 9.1%	94.3%	
N N		9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	
1975 LFPR		94.3% 9.1%	94.3% 9.1%	94.3% 9.1%	
44 N		9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	
$\frac{1974}{\text{LFPR}} \text{ UN}$		94.3% 9.1%	94.3% 9.1%	94.3% 9.1%	
Z3 NP		13%	13%	13%	/
1973 LFPR		93.8% 13%	93.8% 13%	93.84	/
21 M		0	/%.		
1972 LFPR		100%	/ 100 <sub>4</sub> /	/	
1 E	/	10%			
1971 LFPR		91%	/		
	nduating				
	Classes Graduating;	1971	1972	1973	
C STOY ERIC	J				

same as that year's graduating class rates. For 1974-1977 projected LFPR's were computed by taking the total Labor Actual data is encircled. For 1971-1973 LFPR's and unemployment rates of previous classes were assumed to be the employment rates were computed by taking total unemployed graduates of the three graduating classes over total Force Participants of the three graduating classes over total graduates 33/55 = LFPR of 94.3%. Projected un-Labor Force Participants = 3/33 = Unemployment rate of 9.1%. Note:

70

It is also necessary to adjust the earnings of a high school graduate for labor force participation and unemployment. Table 31A shows adjusted mean income of a year round full-time worker, assuming a two percent growth rate. Table 31B shows the labor force participation and unemployment rates used to adjust the mean income in Table 31A. Table 32A shows the labor force participation and unemployment rates used to adjust the mean income of all male workers 18-24 completing four years of high school only, also assuming a two percent growth rate, shown in Table 32B.



# TABLE 31A

for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment of Male Year Round Full-Time Workers age 18-24 with 4 years of Unadjusted Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a 2% Real Growth Rate, and Mean Annual Earnings Adjusted High School Completed for the Years 1971-1977\*

1977	\$7632.51	\$6059.27
1976	\$7482.85	\$5940.46
1975	\$7336.13	\$5823.99
1974	\$7192.29	\$5709.79
1973	\$7051.26	\$5639.77
1972	\$6913.00	\$5350.66
1971	\$6321.00	\$4811.89
	Unadjusted \$6321.00	Adjusted

\*Actual Data was used for 1971 & 1972.

## TABLE 31B

Actual and Projected Labor Force Participation Rates & Unemployment Rates for Male Year Round Full-Time Workers Age 18-24 for the Years 1971-1977

		1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
LFPR		87.4%	%06	91.2%	88.9%	88.9%	88.9%	88.9%
Unemployment	Rate*	12.9%	14%	12.3%	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%

For 1974-1977 the estimated LFPR of 88.9% and Unemployment rate of 10.7% were the averages of LFPR's for 1971-73 and Unemployment rates respectively of the period 1966-1972. \*See table 6 LFPR's & Unemployment rates lag from actual rates for 1971-72 by one year. This adjustment was made to facilitate comparison with Agri-Business Program graduates and to account for the population of High School graduates not enrolled in school for the lat year preceding the Agri-Business Program graduation.



# ABLE 32A

Actual & Projected Labor Force Participation Rates and Unemployment Rates for all males age 18-24 with 4 years of High School completed only for the years 1971-1977

	۵۵	ΔQ
1977	88.9%	10.7%
**************************************		
1976	88.9%	10.7%
1975	88.9%	. 10.7%
1974	88.9%	10.7%
1973	91.2%	12.3%
1972	%06	14%
1971	87.4%	12.9%
·	LFPR	Unemployment Rate

rates respectively of the period 1966-1972. See table 6. For 1971-1973 LFPR's & Unemployment rates lag from actual rates For the 1974-1977 the estimated LFPR of 88.9% and Unemployment rate of 10.7% were averages of the LFPR's and Unemployment for 1971-1972 by one year. This adjustment was made to facilitate comparison with Agri-Business program graduates and to account for the population of high school graduates not enrolled in school for the ½ year preceding the Agri-Business Program graduation.

### TABLE 32B

Unadjusted Expected Mean Annual Income Assuming a 2% Real Growth Rate, and Expected Mean Annual Income Adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment for the Years 1971-1977

1977	\$5340.44	\$4239.65
1976	\$5235.72	\$4156.52
1975	\$5133.06	\$4075.02
1974	\$5032.41	\$3995.11
1973	\$4933.74	\$3946.12
1972	\$4837.00	\$3743.84
1971	\$4195.00	\$3193.46
	Onadjusted	Adjusted

Actual Data used for 1971-1972

\*Unadjusted for labor force participation and unemployment.

Tables 33A and 33B illustrate the computation of deflated adjusted expected earnings of Agri-Business Program students graduating in 1971-1973; assuming a 10 percent growth rate in earnings using deflators 1 and 2 respectively.

As discussed previously, in order to construct benefit-cost ratios, it is necessary that all costs and benefits be discounted for the time value of money. Tables 34A and 34B show the present value (using a five percent discount rate) of the deflated adjusted expected annual earnings of Agri-Business Program graduates that were previously computed in Tables 33A and 33B.

The adjusted expected mean income of high school graduates (whether that of year round full-time workers, Table 35A, or that of all males 18-24, Table 35B) must be brought to the same point in time, in order to properly determine benefit-cost ratios. Again, a five percent discount rate was used.



TABLE 33A

Deflated Unadjusted Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a 10% Growth Rate, and Expected Annual Earnings Adjusted for Labor Force Participation, and Unemployment of Agri-Business Program Students Graduating In 1971-1973 for the Years 1971-1977

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Year of Graduation:							
1971							
Unadjusted	\$4086.72	\$4495.39	\$4944.93	\$5439.47	\$5983.42		
Adjusted	3347.12	4495.39	4035.36	4662.64	5128.91		
1972							
Unadjusted		\$4747.20	\$5221.92	\$5416.70	\$6318.52	\$6950.37	
Adjusted		4747.20	4261.40	4923.70	5416.16	5957.77	
1973							3

\*Deflator 1 figures were used initially.



Adjusted

Unadjusted

\$7940.05

\$7218.23

\$6562.03

\$5965.48

\$5423.16

6806.11

6187.37

5624.88

5113.53

4425.62

# TABLE 33B

Earnings Adjusted for Labor Force Participation, and Unemployment of Agri-Business Program students graduating Deflated Unadjusted Expected Annual Earnings\*, assuming a 10% Real Growth Rate, and Expected Annual in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977

1977									\$8560.94
1976					-	\$7472.35	6405.21		\$7782.68
1975	2.5		\$6470.91	5546,78		\$6793.05	5882.91		\$7075.16
1974			\$5882.65	5042.53		\$6175.50	5293.56		\$6431.96
1973			\$5347.86	4364.17		\$5614.09	4581.44		\$5847.24
1972			\$4861.69	4861.69		\$5103.72	5103.72		The state of the s
1971			\$4419.72	3619.75					
	Year of Graduation:	1971	Unadjusted	Adjusted	1972	Unadjusted	Adjusted	1973	Unadjusted

\*Deflator 2 figures were used initially.



7338,33

6671.20

6064.73

5513,39

4771,70

TABLE 34A

The Present Value of Deflated\*1 Adjusted\*2 Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, Of Agri-Business Program Students Graduating in 1971-1973 for the Years 1971-1977

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	
Years of Graduation:	V						•	
1971							· · · · ·	·-,
Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings	\$3347.12 \$4495.39	\$4495.39	\$4035.36	\$4662.64	\$5128,91			
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings	3186.46	4077.32	3486.55	3837.35	4021.07			
1972								
Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings		\$4747.20	\$4261.40	\$4923.70	\$5416.16	\$5957.77		
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings		4519.33	3865.09	4254.08	4457.50	4670.89		
1973							÷ ,	
Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings			\$5423.16	\$5965.48	\$6562.03	\$7218.23	\$7940.05	
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings			5162.00	5410.69	5669.59	5940.60	6225.14	
*1Deflator l figures were used initially	ially.			~ :	The state of the s			

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}$ 2Adjusted for Labor Force Participation & Unemployement.

TABLE 34B

The Present Value of Deflated\*<sup>1</sup> Adjusted\*<sup>2</sup> Expected Annual Earnings, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, Of Agri-Business Program Students Graduating in 1971-1973 ior the Years 1971-1977

Vears of Graduation.	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
							\$ .425
Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings \$3	\$3619.75	\$4861.69	\$4364.17	\$5042.53	\$5546.78		
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings	3446.00	4409.55	3770.64	4150.04	4348.68		
Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings ,		\$5103.72	\$4581.44	\$5293.56	\$5882.91	\$6405.21	
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings		4858.74	4155.37	4573.64	4841.63	5021.68	
						•	
Adjusted Expected Annual Earnings			\$5847.24	\$6431.96	\$7075.16	\$7782.68	\$8560.94
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings			5566.57	5833.79	6112.94	6405.15	6711.78

 $<sup>^{*1}{\</sup>rm Deflator}$  2 figures were used initially.

 $<sup>^{*}2</sup>_{\mbox{Adjusted for Labor Force Participation}}$  . Unemployment.

The Present Value of Adjusted\* Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, of The Present Value of Adjusted\* Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, of Incorresponding With Agri-Business Incorrespondent Wi TABLE 35A

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Years of Graduation:							
1971							
Adjusted Mean Annual Earnings	\$4811.59	\$5350.66	\$5639.77	\$5709.79	\$5823.99		
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings	4580.92	4853.05	4872.76	4699.16	4566.01		
1972							
Adjusted Mean Annual Earnings		\$5350.66	\$5639.77	\$5709.79	\$5823.99	\$5940.46	
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings	••	5093.83	5115.27	4933.26	4793.14	4657.32	
1973							
Adjusted Mean Annual Earnings			\$5639.77	\$5709.79	\$5823.99	\$5940.46	\$6059.28
Present Value of Adjusted Earnings			5369.06	5173.78	5031.93	4892.40	4750.48

<sup>\*</sup>Adjusted for Labor Force Participation & Unemployment.

The Present Value of Adjusted\* Expected Mean Annual Income, Assuming a Social Discount Rate of 5%, for all The Present Value of Adjusted\* Expected Mean Annual Income, Assuming with Agri-Business Program students graduating and sales age 18-24 with 4 years of High School completed; corresponding with Agri-Business Program students graduating 1971-1977

TABLE 35B

Adjusted Mean Annual Income \$3743.84 \$3946.12 \$3995.11 \$4075.02 \$4156.52  Present Value of Adjusted Income \$3564.14 3579.13 3452.64 3353.74 3258.71  L973  Adjusted Mean Annual Income \$33946.12 \$3995.11 \$4075.02 \$4156.52 \$4239.65  Present Value of Adjusted Income 3756.71 3623.56 3520.82 3420.82 3323.89	Years of Graduation:    1971	1971 \$3193.46 3040.17	1972 \$3743.84 3395.66	1973 \$3946.12 3409.45	\$3995.11 3287.98	1975 \$4075.02 3194.82	1.976	1977
3564.14 3579.13 3452.64 3353.74 3258.71 \$3946.12 \$3995.11 \$4075.02 \$4156.52 3756.71 3623.56 3520.82 3420.82	Adjusted Mean Annual Income		\$3743.84	\$3946.12	\$3995.11	\$4075.02	\$4156.52	
\$3946.12 \$3995.11 \$4075.02 \$4156.52 Gome 3756.71 3623.56 3520.82 3420.82	Present Value of Adjusted Income		3564.14	3579.13	3452,64	3353.74	3258.71	
\$3946.12 \$3995.11 \$4075.02 \$4156.52 come 3756.71 3623.56 3520.82 3420.82	1973							
3756.71 3623.56 3520.82 3420.82	an Annual Income			\$3946.12	\$3995.11	\$4075.02	\$4156.52	\$4239.65
	Present Value of Adjusted Income			3756.71	3623.56	3520.82	3420.82	3323.89

\*Adjusted for Labor Force Participation & Unemployment.

CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIETAL AND PRIVATE BENEFIT COST RATIOS



The computation of societal benefit cost ratios entails first determining the income differential between an Agri-Business Program graduate and a high school graduate. This was accomplished by subtracting the present value of expected adjusted mean income of a high school graduate from the present value of deflated adjusted expected earnings for each graduating class. This income differential was then multiplied by the number of students graduating from the Agri-Business Program in order to determine the net present value of total social benefits of the program. This amount, total social benefits, was then divided by the present value of societal economic costs in order to yield societal benefit-cost ratios.

Tables 36A, B, C, D, and E present societal benefit-cost ratios under varying assumptions as to societal economic costs. Remember that the decision rule as to whether to invest or not; is the benefit-cost ratio must equal or exceed one for investment to occur. In the selection among several projects and budget constraints exist, projects are selected that have the highest benefit-cost ratio, until either the funds are exhausted or benefit-cost ratios are less than one.

Although only a five-year time horizon was used, it must be remembered that the discounting process will considerably reduce the effect on the benefit-cost ratios of a sustained superior growth rate for a time horizon greater than five years.

It is clear that the 1971 class even under the most favorable assumptions has a societal benefit-cost ratio that is less than one. While the 1973 class even under the least favorable assumptions always enjoys at the least a positive benefit-cost ratio and under the more favorable assumptions has several benefit-cost ratios greatly in excess of one. While differences in ability or motivation may partially be the cause of this discrepancy (in which case the benefits would be adjusted downwards for earnings differences caused by increased motivation



or ability) another cause might be improvements in the quality of the program.

However, this is mere speculation.

As noted earlier, private economic benefits differ from societal economic benefits only in that the latter are gross of income taxes while the former is net of income taxes. Because of this difference an adjustment had to be made to reduce the present value of expected mean annual earnings (of both the Agri-Business Program graduate and the high school graduate) for estimated income taxes. Estimated federal income tax rates were obtained from a chart found in Dr. Ghazalah's 1972 cost benefit study. (see following page)

Tables 37A, B, C, and D illustrate the adjustment of earnings for taxes. Also, they illustrate that the expected earnings were matched with the mean income of year round full-time workers or all male workers under either deflator 1 or deflator 2 earnings assumptions was necessary to compute net private benefits. The tax rates were assumed to remain constant throughout the time horizon. The estimated tax rates were applied against earnings adjusted for labor force participation and unemployment. Consequently, the tax rates used were those based on adjusted income rather than unadjusted. A summary of net present value of private economic benefits under the various assumptions as to deflators and mean income of a high school graduate appears in Table 38.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Ghazalah, Ismail, "The Role of Vocational Education in Improving Skills and Earning Capacity in the State of Ohio: A Cost-Benefit Study", Ohio University, November, 1972, p. 17.



TABLE 36A

The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973

	1971	1972	1973
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a 'Agri-Business graduate (Deflator II)	\$20,124.91	\$23,451.06	\$30,630.23
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male year round full-time worker	23,571.87	24,592.82	25,217.65
Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits per graduate	-3,446.96	-1,141.76	5,412.58
# of Agri-Business graduates	x 11	x 8	x 16
Total Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits	-37,916.56	-9,134.08	88,601.28
Total Social Economic Costs Per Class	166,503.18	188,938.81	261,422.31
Benefit/Cost Ratio	<b>~</b> 22 <b>.</b> 8%	-4.8%	33.9%
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator II)	\$20,124.91	\$23,451.06	\$30,630.23
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male (Age: 18-24) worker	16,328.83	17,208.36	17,645.43
Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits per graduate	+3,796.83	+6,242.70	+12,984.43
# of Agri-Business graduates	x 11	x 8	x 16
Total Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits	41,765.13	49,941.70	207,750.88
Total Social Economic Costs Per Class	166,503.18	188,938.81	261,422.31
Benefit/Cost Ratio	+25.1%	26.4%	79.5%



### TABLE 36B

The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973

	1971	1972	1973
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator I)	\$18,608.75	\$21,766.89	\$28,408.02
Present Value of Expected Earnings of Male Year Round Full-Time Worker	23,571.87	24,592.82	25,217.65
Net Present Value of Societal Economia Benefits per graduate	c -4,963.12	-2,825.93	+3,190.37
# of Agri-Business Graduates	<u>x 11</u>	x 8	x 16
Total Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits	-54,594.32	-22,607.46	+51,045.92
Total Social Economic Costs Per Class	166,503.18	188,938.81	261,422.31
Benefit/Cost Ratio	-32.7%	-11.9%	+19.5%
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business Graduate (Deflator I)	\$18,608.75	\$21,766.89	\$28,408.02
Present Value of Expectel Earnings of a Male age: 18-24 Worker	16,328.08	17,208.36	17,645.80
Net Present Value of Societal Economi Benefits per graduate	c +2,280.67	+4,558.53	10,762.27
# of Agri-Business graduates	<u>x 11</u>	x 8	x 16
Total Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits	+25,087.37	+36,448.24	+172,196.32
Total Social Economic Costs Per Class	166,503.18	188,938.81	261,422.31
Benefit/Cost Ratio	15.1%	19.3%	65.9%



TABLE 36C

The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973

· <b>~</b>	1971	1972	1973
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator I)	\$18,608.75	\$21,766.89	\$28,408.02
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male year round full-time worker	23,571.87	24,592.82	25,217.65
Net Present Value of SEB per graduate	-4,963.12	-2,825.93	+3,190.37
# of Agri-Business graduates	x_11	x 8	<u>x 16</u>
Total Net Present Value of SEB	-54,594.32	-22,607.44	+51,045.92
Total Societal Economic Costs Per Class*	142,840.52	162,497.53	224,859.23
Benefit/Cost Ratio	-38.2%	-13.9%	+22.7%
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator II)	\$20,124.91	\$23,451.06	\$30,630.23
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male year round full-time worker	23,571.87	24,592.82	25,217.65
Net'Present Value of SEB per graduate	-3,446.96	-1,141.76	+5,412.58
# of Agri-Business graduates	x 11	x 8	<u>x 16</u>
Total Net Present Value of SEB	-37,916.56	-9,134.08	+88,601.28
Total Societal Economic Costs Per Chass*	142,840.52	162,497.53	224,859.23
Benefit/Cost Ratio	-26.5%	<b>~</b> 5.6%	+39.4%

<sup>\*</sup>Student Opportunity Costs were computed by using the mean income of male year round full-time workers adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment and reduced by adjusted summer earnings of the same.



TABLE 36D

The Net Present Value of Societal Foonomic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5% for the District One Technical Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973

	1971	1972	1973
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator I)	\$18,608.75	\$21,766.89	\$28,408.02
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male worker (Age: 18-24)	16,328.08	17,208.36	17,645.80
Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits per graduate	: +2,280.67	+4,558.53	+10,762.22
# of Agri-Business graduates	x 11	<u>x 8</u>	x 16
Total Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits	25 <b>,0</b> 87.37	36,448.24	172,196.32
Total Social Economic Costs Per Class	102,767.32	<b>11</b> 8,231.21	168,061.21
Benefit/Cost Ratio	24.4%	30.8%	102.3%
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator II)		\$23,451.06	\$30,630.23
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male worker (Age: 18-24)	16,328.08	17,208.36	17,645.80
Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits per graduate	: +3 <b>,</b> 796 <b>.</b> 83	+6,242.70	+12,984.43
'# of Agri-Business graduates	<u>x 11</u>	<u>x 8</u>	<u>x 16</u>
Total Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits	41,765.13	44,941.60	207,750.88
Total Social Economic Costs Per Class	102,767.32	118,231.21	168,061.21
Benefit/Cost Ratio	<b>4</b> 0.6%	38.0%	123.6%



TABLE 36E 87

The Net Present Value of Societal Economic Benefits, Assuming a 5-Year
Time Horizon, and a Social Discount Rate = 5%, for the District One Technical
Institute's Agri-Business Program Graduates in the Years 1971-1973

	1971	1972	1973
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator I)	\$18,608.75	\$21,766.89	\$28,408.02
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male year round full-time worker	23,571.87	24,592.82	25,217.65
Net Present Value of SEB per graduate	-4,963.12	-2,825.93	+3,190.37
# of Agri-Business graduates	x 11	x 8	x 16
Total Net Present Value of SEB	-54,594.32	-22,607.44	+51,045.92
Total Societal Economic Costs Per Class*	99,357.59	114,861.95	164,552.43
Benefit/Cost Ratio	-54.9%	-19.7%	+31%
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a Agri-Business graduate (Deflator II)	\$20,124.91	\$23,451.06	\$30,630.23
Present Value of Expected Earnings of a male year round full-time worker	23,571.87	24,592.82	25,217.65
Net Present Value of SEB per graduate	-3,446.96	-1,141.76	+5,412.58
# of Agri-Business graduates	x <u>11</u>	<u>x 8</u>	<u>x 16</u>
Total Net Present Value of SEB	-37,916.56	-9,134.08	+88,601.28
Total Societal Economic Costs Per Class*	99,357.59	114,861.95	164,552.43
Benefit/Cost Ratio	-38.2%	-8%	+53.8%

<sup>\*</sup>Student Opportunity Costs were computed by using the mean income of male (18-24) workers adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment and reduced by summer earnings (10/52 of the mean income of male year round full-time workers).





### EFFECTIVE RATES OF FEDERAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX (TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969)

Annual Income (dollars)	Actual Tax Rate (percent)
	٠.
1500	. 0
1500 2000	0.3
2000 2500	1.5
2500 3000	2.5
3000 3500	3.3
3500 4000	4.2
4000 4500	5.0
4500 5000	5.5
5000 6000	6.2
6000 7000	7.1
7000 8000	7.3
8000 9000	8.1
9000 10,000	8.5
10,000 11,000	9.2
11,000 12,000	9.6
12,000 13,000	10.1
13,000 15,000	10.9
15,000 20,000	11.9
20,000 25,000 3	13.6

### Reprinted from:

Ghazalah, Ismail, The Role or Vocational Education in Improving Skills and Earning Capacity in the State of Ohio: A Cost Benefit Study", 1972.



TABLE 37A

Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon of 5 Years and a Private Discount Rate = 5%; for Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977 The Net Present Value of Deflated\* Adjusted\*\* Expected Mean Annual Earnings,

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Agri-Business Program Graduate	3,881.31	3,873.45	3,312.22	3,626.30	3,771.76		
Ma'le Worker	2,939.85	3,253.05	3,226.25	3,149.88	3,035.07		
Net Economic Benefits	+941.46	+620.40	+85.97	+476.42	+736.69		
1972 Agri-Business Program Graduate		4,270.77	3,671.84	4,020.10	4,181.13	4,381.30	
Male Worker		3,414.44	3,428.81	3,306.80	3,186.05	3,095.78	
Net Economic Benefits		+856.33	+243.03	+713.30	+995.08	1,285.52	
1973 Agri-Business Program Graduate			4,002.53	4,350.42	4,558.58	4,730.61	4,957.13
Male Worker			3,598.92	3,471.38	3,344.78	3,249.78	3,157.69
(July Economic Benefits			+403.61	+879.04	+1,213.80	+1,480.83	+1,799.44

<sup>\*</sup>Deflator I figures were used.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment.

# TABLE 37B

The Net Present Value of Deflated\* Adjusted\*\* Expected Mean Annual Earnings, Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon or 5 Years and a Private Discount Rate - 5%; For Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
1971					•		
Agri-Business Program Graduate	\$3,881.31	\$3,873.45	\$3,312.22	\$3,626.30	\$3,771.76		·
Male Year Round Full-Time Worker	4,328.97	4,552.16	4,570.65	4,407.81	4,882.92		
Net Economic Benefits	-447.66	-678.71	-1,258.43	-781.51	-511.16		
1972							
Agri-Business Program Graduate	~•	\$4,270.77	\$3,671.84	\$4,020.10	\$4,181.13	\$4,381.30	
Male Year Round Full-Time Worker		4,778.01	4,798.12	4,627.40	4,495.97	4,368.57	
Net Economic Benefits		-507.24	-1,126.28	-607.30	-314.84	+12.73	
1973	,						
Agri-Bsuiness Program Graduate			\$4,002.53	\$4,350.42	\$4,558.58	\$4,730.61	\$4,957.13
Male Year Round Full-Time Worker			5,036.18	4,857.70	4,719.95	4,585.88	4,413.20
Net Economic Benefits			-1,033.65	-507.28	-161.37	+144.73	+543.96

<sup>\*</sup>Deflator I figures were used.

A

<sup>\*\*</sup>Adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment.

TABLE 37C

Of 5 Years and a Private Discount Rate = 5%; for Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977 Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon The Net Present Value of Deflated\* Adjusted\*\* Expected Mean Annual Earnings,

1975 1976 1977	·	4079.58	3035.07	+1044,51		4541.45 4665.15	3186.05 3095.78	+1355.40 +1569.37		4867.89 5100.58 5333.26	3344.78 3249.78 3157.69	+1523.11 +1850.80 +2175.57
1974		,3892.70	3149.88	+742.82		4290.07	3306.80	+983.27	•	4690.60	3471.38	+1219.22
1973		;3582.11	3226.25	+355.86	•	3947.60	3428.81	+518.79		4292.81	3598.92	+693.89
1972		4167.03	3253.05	+913.98		4557.50	3414.44	+1143,06				
1971		3301.27	2939.85	+361.42						·		
	1971	Agri-Business Program Graduate	Male Worker	Net Economic Benefits	1972	Agri-Business Program Graduate	Male Worker	Net Economic Benefits	1973	Agri-Business Program Graduate	Male Worker	Net Economic Benefits

<sup>\*</sup>Deflator 2 figures were used.



<sup>\*\*</sup>Adjusted for Labor Force participation and unemployment.

TABLE 37D

Net of Federal Income Taxes, of Agri-Business Frogram Graduates, Assuming a Time Horizon of 5 Years and a Frivate Discount Rate = 5%; for Classes Graduating in 1971-1973, for the Years 1971-1977 The Net Present Value of Deflated\* Adjusted\*\* Expected Mean Annual Earnings,

	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	
1971								
Agri-Business Program Graduate	3,301.27	4,167.03	3,582.11	3,892.70	4,079.58			
Male Worker (Year round full-	4,328.97	4,552.16	4,570.65	4,407.81	4,282.92			
	-1,027.70	-385.13	-987.95	-515.11	-203.34			
1972								
Agri-Business Program Graduate		4,557.50	3,947.60	4,290.07	4,541.45	4,665.15		
Male Worker (Year round full-	·	4,778.01	4,798.12	4,627.40	4,495.97	4,368.57		
Net Economic Benefits		-220.51	-850.52	-337.33	+45.48	+296.58		
1973								
Agri-Business Program Graduate			4,252.81	4,690.60	4,867.89	5,100.58	5,333.26	
Male Worker (Year round full-			5,036.18	4,857.70	4,719,70	4,585.88	4,413.20	
Net Economic Benefits			-743.37	-167.10	+148.19	+514.70	+920.06	

\*Deflator 2 figures were used.

\*\*Adjusted for Labor Force Participation and Unemployment.



The private economic benefits as computed above (See Table 38) when divided by the private economic costs as previously computed; yields private economic benefit-cost ratios. Tables 39A and 39B show the benefit-cost ratios under differing assumptions as to deflated earnings. As with the societal benefit-cost ratios there is a marked upward trend in private economic benefit-cost ratios from the 1971 class to the 1973 class. Again, the 1971 class has a benefit-cost ratio less than one in every case, while the 1973 class has a benefit-cost ratio very much greater than one in several cases. Upon even casual observation of these ratios it is clear that the choices of assumptions have a marked affect on the final outcome.

For the technical institute administrator who faces budget constraints in resource allocation to programs, and for the student who must decide which among several alternative programs to enter, it is self-evident that cost benefit analysis is extremely useful in decision making.



TABLE 38

The Net Present Value of Private Economic Benefits\* of an Agri-Business Program Graduate, Graduating in 1971-1973, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon and a Private Discount Rate = 5%

	1971	1972	1973
Deflator 2:			
Male Worker	+ 3,418.59	+ 5,569.79	+ 7,462.59
Year Round Full-Time Worker	~ 3,119.23	- 1,066.30	+ 672.48
Deflator 1:			
Male Worker	+ 2,860.94	+ 4,093.26	+ 5,776.72
Male Year Round Full-Time Worker	<b>-</b> 3,677.47	<b>2,542.93</b>	+ 1,013.61

<sup>\*</sup>Benefits are reduced by federal income taxes.



Private Economic Benefit-Cost Ratios of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Graduating in 1971-1973, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon and a Private Discount Rate = 5%

•		1971	1972	1973
Deflator I:				
Private Economic Benefits	(A)	+2,860.94	+4,093.26	+5,776.72
Private Economic Costs	(C)	4,987.42	5,213.00	5,459.38
Benefit/Cost Ratio		57.3%	78.5%	105.8%
Private Economic Benefits	(A)	+2,860.94	+4,093.26	+5,776.72
Private Economic Costs	(D)	4,696.26	4,885.88	5,242.56
Benefit/Cost Ratio		60.9%	83.7%	110.1%
Private Economic Benefits	(B)	- 3,677.47	- 2,542.93	- 1,013.61
Private Economic Costs	(E)	10,376.74	10,412.56	10,762.84
Benefit/Cost Ratio		-35.4%	-24.1%	+9.4%
Private Economic Benefits	(B)	-3,677.47	-2,542.93	+1,013.61
Private Economic Costs	(F)	8,374.92	8,466.28	8,664.00
Benefit/Cost Ratio		43.9%	30.0%	11.7%

- (A) PEB when matched with all male workers 18-24.
- (B) PEB when matched with male year round full-time workers.
- (C) PEC computed with s.o.c. = adjusted mean income of all male workers 18-24 reduced by summer earnings of same.
- (D) PEC computed with s.o.c = adjusted mean income of all males reduced by summer earnings of a year round full-time worker.
- (E) PEC computed with s.o.c. = mean income of year round full-time workers reduced by summer earnings of all males.
- (F) PEC computed with s.o.c. = mean income of year round full-time workers reduced by summer earnings of same.



Private Economic Benefit-Cost Ratios of Agri-Business Program Graduates, Graduating in 1971-1973, Assuming a 5-Year Time Horizon and a Private Discount Rate = 5%

	1971	1972	1973
Deflatc: :			
Private Economic Benefits (A)	+3,418.59	+5,569.79	+7,462.59
Private Economic Costs (C)	4,987.42	5,213.00	5,459.38
Benefit/Cost Ratio	68.5%	106.5%	136.7%
Private Economic Benefits (A)	+3,418.59	+5,569.79	+7,462.59
Private Economic Costs (D)	4,696.26	4,885.88	5,242.56
Benefit/Cost Ratio	72.7%	114.0%	142.3%
Private Economic Benefits (B)	- 3,119.23	- 1,066.30	+ 672.48
Private Economic Costs (E)	10,376.74	10,412.56	10,762.84
Benefit/Cost Ratio	-30.1%	-10.2%	+6.3%
Private Economic Benefits (B)	-3,119.23	-1,066.30	+ 672.48
Private Economic Costs (F)	8,374.92	8,466.28	8,644.06
Benefit/Cost Ratio	-37.2%	-12.6%	*+7.8%

- (A) Private Economic Benefits when matched with all male workers 18-24.
- (B) Private Economic Benefits when matched with male year round full-time workers.
- (C) Private Economic Costs computed with s.o.c. = adjusted mean income of all males reduced by summer earnings of same.
- (D) Private Economic Costs computed with s.c.c. = adjusted mean income of all males reduced by year round full-time worker summer earnings.
- (E) Private Economic Costs computed with s.o.c. = mean income of year round fulltime workers reduced by summer earnings of all male workers.
- (F) Private Economic Costs computed with s.o.c. = mean income of year round fulltime workers reduced by summer earnings of same.



APPENDIX 1

MATERIAL RELATED TO PRIVATE ECONOMIC COSTS

AREA VOCATIONAL, TECHNICAL AND ADULT EDUCATION DISTRICT ONE

```
APPROXIMATE COST FOR ATTENDING DISTRICT ONE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE - EAU CLAIRE
ALL STUDENTS:
    Registration Fee and Activity Fee - $25 per semester
      Price range is from $10 to $14 per week depending upon accommodations
      and the number of students involved.
<code>MEALS:</code> Students should budget \$3 to \$4 per day.
RESIDENT HALL LIVING UW-EC: Room $263.50 per semester; board $243 per sem. (subject to change)
GRADUATION FEE - $10
ESTIMATE FOR BOOKS AND CLASSROOM SUPPLIES FOR ONE YEAR:
    (Approximately two-thirds of this amount is due on registration day as many of the books
    are used for two semesters.) There is an opportunity to buy used books for some classes.
    This could reduce book costs.
    Account Clerk - $70
    Accounting - $80
     Agricultural Mechanics - $65
    Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Technology - $90
     Appliance Servicing - $60
   - Audio Visual Assistant - $70
     Auto Body - $60
    Automotive Mechanics - $65
    Barbering - Books $66 - Supplies $70 (Estimate)
    Chemicals & Fertilizers - $65
    Child Care Assistant - $60
    Civil Structural Technology - $120
    Clerk Typist - $60
    Clerk Typist-Medical - $70
    Data Preparation - $60
    Data Processing - $70
    Diesel Mechanics - $65
    Drafting-Mechanical (Industrial) - $100
     Electrical Power Distribution (Lineman) - $50
     Electronics Servicing - $65
    Electronics Technology (Industrial) - $90
    Fashion Merchandising - $70
    Feeds, Seeds, & Farm Supply - $65
    Fluid Power Maintenance - $60
    Fluid Power Technology - $65
    Machine Tool - $50
    Machinery, Partsman-Salesman - $65
    Marketing - $70
    Mechanical Design Drafting Technology - $110
    Medical Lab Technology - $100 (Does not include uniform, insurance, licensure exam, etc.)
    Medical Records Technology - $150 (Does not include uniform, insurance, licensure exem, etc)
    Metal Fabrication - $60
    Police Science - $75
    Practical Nursing - $75 (Does not include uniform, insurance, licensure exam, etc.)
    Precision Inspection & Materials Testing - $60
    Pre-Service Nursing Assistant - Total Education Cost $30.50
    In-Service Nursing Assistant - Total Educational Cost $24.50
    Quantity Foods Preparation - $50
    Radiologic Technology - $100 (Does not include uniform, insurance, licensure exam, etc.)
    Refrigeration Servicing - $70
    Restaurant & Hotel Cookery - $65
```

Secretarial Science - \$70

Prography - \$60 ling - \$50

# LASS FEE SCHEDULE:

Estimated class and laboratory fees (Approximately 1/2 of the total for one semester). Class fees are due on registration day. Total lab fees for any one semester may vary in reference to elective classes selected.

in reference to elective classes selected.		
A. C.	<u>lst Year Est.</u> \$ 19.50	<u> 2nd lear Est.</u>
Account Clerk	, , ,	\$
Accounting	18.00 25.00	15 00
Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Technology		40.00
Agricultural Mechanics	162 50 (Est ) 111.00	(Not Available)
Appliance Servicing Summer Session	21.00	•
Audio Visual Assistant	84.50	M E. W.
Auto Body	141.50	<b>₽</b> •
Automotive Mechanics	141.50	
Barbering	97 . 50	£32.00
Chemicals & Fertilizers	26.50	20 00
Livil Structural Technology	25.50	24.50
Child (are Assistant	27.00	24.50
Clerk Typist	31.50	The Eth Arts
[lerk Typist-Medical	23.00	*** **********************************
Data Preparation	33.50	-
Data Processing	23 00	24 00
Diesel Mechanics	144.00	148.50
Prafting-Mechanical (Industrial)	25.00	140.70
Electrical Power Distribution (Lineman)	89.00	** ** *** ** ***
Electronics Servicing	33.50	51 00
·	31 50	45.00
lectronics Technology (Industrial)	15.50	
ashion Merchandising	26 50	30 00
Feeds, Seeds & Farm Supply	61.00	20 00
[luid Power Maintenance		1.1 50
Fluid Powe: Technology	34.00	41 50
Machine Tool	99 50 22 00	10.00
vachinery, Partsman-Salesman	16.00	19.00
marketing	44 00	16.50
Mechanical Design Drafting Technolgy	118.50	23 . 50 80 . 00
Medical Lab Technology	61 50	44.50
nedical Records Technology Netal Fabrication	174.00	44.50
Police Science	13.00	28 00
Practical Nursing	89 00	
Summer Session	14.50	* * *
Precision Inspection & Materials Testing	78 . 50	
Pre-Service Nursing Assistant (Total Educational Co	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	** ***
in-Service Nursing Assistant (Total Educational Co		
Production Agriculture (Registration Fee-\$12 per se		
general course, \$13 for Welding) Quantity Foods Preparation	76 50	87.50
(Does not include uniformsprices range from )	=	0ر. ره
Radiologic Technology	82.00	105.00
Summer Session	44.50	יטט. כט ו
Refrigeration Servicing	110 00	
Summer Session	21.00	• • •
Restaurant & Hotel Cookery	76.00	95 00
(Does not include uniformsprices range from		32 00
secretarial Science	22.50	23.50
tenographe:	31 50	43.50:
velding	136 00	50 <b>er</b> *
lood Technics	111.50	
ending amount to Development I Develop	2 00	
lath	5.00 3.50	• •
EDIC	J. J.	

#### TOOL BOXES

Agri-Mechanics	\$164.00
Auto Body	128.50
Auto Mechanics I	170.50
Auto Mechanics II	30.00
Diesel Mechanics	164.00
Refrigeration Servicing	65.50
Appliance Servicing	65.50

Coveralls or shop coats <u>are required</u> in all Trade & Industrial training programs of a mechanical nature. The cost of this clothing on a rental basis is included in the class fee schedule.

Safety glasses are also required for many of the Trade & Industrial areas of training. (\$5.50 non-prescription glasses) These are to be purchased by the student on registration day. Prescription glasses vary in price depending upon the correction required. The cost for the eye examination and the dispensing of the prescription glasses is a personal obligation of the student.

## TUITION:

There is no tuition for any resident of Area Vocational, Technical and Adult Education District One.

Wisconsin residents of other Vocational Technical and Adult School Districts may have their tuition paid by their local Vocational Board providing:

- 1. that such District does not offer a similar training program.
- 2. that the student notifies such District on the required form. (Non-resident tuition forms are mailed to the student upon receipt of application)
- 3. that the District agrees to pay such non-resident tuition.

Non-resident tuition rates are computed from a formula provided by the Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education. The rates vary from year to year as they are based on current instruction costs. (The non-district resident tuition rate for the academic school year 1974-75 is \$800)

TUITION PAYMENTS ARE DUE AT TIME OF REGISTRATION AND MUST BE PAID AT LEAST ONE-HALF A SEMESTER (NINE WEEKS) IN ADVANCE.

Enrollment Tests	\$ 3.00 (\$1.00 for	only one test)
A.C.T.	7.00	
Graduation Fee	10.00	
GED Tests	15.00	



APPENDIX 2

MATERIAL RELATED TO SOCIETAL ECONOMIC COSTS

# Agri-Business (Marketing)

The Agri-Business course is designed to provide technical instruction for students who are interested in employment related to agriculture. The Agri-Business program in Eau Claire is designed to provide training for distribution positions specializing in agricultural products and equipment. The machinery-salesman program deals chiefly with farm implements and equipment from a businessman's viewpoint. The curriculum incorporates a combination of agricultural technology, general education and marketing education. Students completing the program are eligible for employment in the area of agricultural sales, advertising, and business management.

ninem CCl	(DOMED	
FIRST SEA	Course Name	Credits
No.	Communication Skills I	3
801-151 005-143	Principles of Agri-Marketing I	3
005-143	Farm Equipment I	3
809-151	Psychology of Human Relations	3
105-101	Business Mathematics	3
106-180	Records Management	3 2
100-100	Mecolds branagement	
		18
SECOND S	EMESTER	_
801-152	Communication Skills II .	3
005-147	Inventory Control	3 3 4 •
005-152		3
005-137	Agri-Business Selling	3
101-111	Accounting I	4
		17
		<b>~</b> 1
THIRD SE	MESTER	
102-170	Credit Procedures	3
	Principles of Advertising	4
104-118	Layout and Lettering Techniques	2 2 3 \
104-119	Visual Merchandising	2
809-153	American Institutions	
	Elective	3
:		17
FOURTH S	SEMESTER	
005-141	Oragnization and Function of Agri-Business	4
102-106	Economics	3
106-131	Typing I or II	3
102-160	Business Law	3
	Elective	3
		16
		827 W. 10

A minimum of 64 credits is required for the Associate Degree. Grades must average 2.0 for all courses taken (C average).



# Agri-Business

### ASSOCIATE DEGREE

The Agri-Business course is designed to provide technical instruction for students who are interested in employment related to agriculture. The Agri-Business program in Eau Claire is designed to provide training for distribution positions specializing in agricultural products and equipment. The machinery-salesman program deals chiefly with farm implements

and equipment from a businessman's viewpoint. The curriculum incorporates a combination of agricultural technology, general education and marketing education. Students completing the program are eligible for employment in the areas of agricultural sales, advertising, and business management.

#### FIRST SEMESTER Course No. Course Name Credits Communication Skills I 801-151 3 005-143 Principles of Agri-Marketing 3 Farm Equipment I 005-151 3 809-151 Psychology of Human Relations 3 105-101 **Business Mathematics** 3 15 SECOND SEMESTER Communication Skills II 801-152 3 Inventory Control 005-147 3 Farm Equipment II 005-152 3 Agri-Business Selling 3 105-137 101-111 Accounting I 4 16 THIRD SEMESTER 104-162 Credit Procedures 104-125 Principles of Advertising 104-119 Visual Merchandising 2 101-118 Layout and Lettering Techniques ź 809-153 American Institutions Elective 3 17 FOURTH SEMESTER 005-141 Organization and Function of Agri-Business 4 809-110 Economics 3 106-131 Typing I or II 3 102-160 Business Law 3 Elective 3 16

#### ELECTIVES:

104-113 Retailing, 104-192 Insurance, 104-160 Sales Management, 104-126 Advertising Techniques, 102-134 Introduction to Business, 102-136 Personnel Management, 101-112 Accounting II, 107-102 Introduction to Data Processing, 810-116 Speech, 106-180 Records Management, 103-120 Machine Calculation. Other electives in other departments such as Fluid Power (Hydraulics), Diesel Engines, Welding, etc, may be taken upon approval of the division coordinator.

TOTAL PROGRAM CREDITS

64



44

# Fall 1969

COCT TIBE				
Course No.	Description	Teacher(s)	Room No. No.	No. of Sections
801-151	Commun. Skills I	Schmelling <sup>1</sup> , Skamser <sup>1</sup> , Walhstrom <sup>2</sup> , Klawiter <sup>1</sup> , Qualye <sup>3</sup> , Lansing <sup>3</sup>	(226 <sup>4</sup> , 235 <sup>1</sup> , 220 <sup>2</sup> , 233 <sup>4</sup> )	11
005-143	Princip. of Agri-Mktg I	Rounsville	$(116^1)$	Т
005-151	Farm Equip. I	Kliner <sup>2</sup>	(118 <sup>2</sup> )	2
809-151	Psych. of Human Rel.	Van Gordon <sup>2</sup> , Beyreis <sup>1</sup>	(237 <sup>2</sup> , 235)	ю
105-101	Business Math	J. Severson <sup>3</sup> , Beyreis <sup>3</sup> , Helgeson <sup>3</sup> , M. Johnson <sup>1</sup> , Olson <sup>1</sup>	$(235^3, 213^6, 114^1, 215^1)$	11
106-180	Records Mgmt.	Sequin <sup>4</sup> , Gravunder <sup>3</sup>	(211 <sup>6</sup> , 235 <sup>1</sup> )	7
120 Spring 1970				ú
801-152	Commun. Skills II	Walhstrom <sup>5</sup> , Moldenhauer <sup>1</sup> , Quayle <sup>4</sup>	(222 <sup>1</sup> , 226 <sup>4</sup> , 220 <sup>5</sup> )	10
005-147	Inventory Control	Rounsville <sup>l</sup>	(New Bldg.)	rī.
005-152	Farm Equipment II	Kliner <sup>1</sup>	(New Bldg.)	1
005-137	Agri-Business Selling	Rounsville	(116)	1
101-111	Accounting I	${\tt Tremain}^3$ , Wendt $^1$	$(203^1, 227^2, 229^1)$	4
•				

	Course No.	Description	Teacher(s)	Room No. No. of	f Sections
	801-151	Comm. Skills I	Duerst $^3$ , Lansing $^3$ Walde, Barry $^3$ , Quayle $^2$ , Klawiter $^1$	$(235^1, 220^1, 124^1, 211^1$ $226^5, 213^2, 237^1, 230^1)$	13
	005-143	Princ. of Agri-Mktg'I	Rounsville	(111)	1
	005-151	Farm Equip. I	Kliner <sup>2</sup>	(New Shop)	2
•	809-151	Psychology of H R	Wahlstrom $^1$ , D. Severson $^2$ ,	(237 <sup>1</sup> , 228 <sup>2</sup> )	ю
	105-101	. Business Math	Beyreis <sup>1</sup> , Braune <sup>5</sup> , J. Severson <sup>2</sup> , M. Johnson <sup>3</sup> , Helgeson <sup>1</sup>	$(235^1, 129^1, 111^1, 114^1, 118^1, 233^3, 215^1, 230^1, 237^1)$	) 12
	106-180	Records Mgmt.	Skamser <sup>2</sup> , Gravunder <sup>3</sup> , Hanson <sup>2</sup>	(211 <sup>2</sup> , 211 <sup>5</sup> )	7
	*****	******************************	***************************************	************	****
1	104-162	Credit Proc.	Rounsville <sup>3</sup>	$(118^2, 124^1)$	ĸ
21	<b>21</b> 104-118	Layout & Lettering Techn.	Jankowski	(118 <sup>2</sup> )	2
	104-119	Visual Mdseing	$Becher^2$	(114 <sup>2</sup> )	2
	809-153	Am Instit.	Van $Gordon^1$ , D. Severson $^1$ , $Stacy^1$	$(220^{1}, 228^{1}, 124^{1})$	ю
	104-113	Elective Retailing	E. Johnson	$(114^{1})$	П
	104-125	Principle of Adv.	$\mathtt{Becher}^1$	$(114^1)$	П
	Spring 1971				
	801-152	Comm. Skills II	$walde^6$ , $Barry^2$ , $Duerst^2$ , $Klawiter^3$ , $Lewis^3$	$(220^1, 230^4, 235^7, 211^1, 2222^2, 116^1, 145^3)$	16
	005-147	Inventory Control	${ t Rounsville}^1$	(Ag. Lab)	1
	005-152	Farm Equip. II	$ ext{Kliner}^1$	(M-135)	1
	005-137	Agri-Business Selling	Rounsville <sup>2</sup>	(116, 111)	2
	101-111	Acctg. I	Devine <sup>2</sup>	(2292)	7

Wided by ERIC	course No.	Description	Teacher(s)	Room No.	No. of Sections
	005-141	Org. & Funct. of Agri-Business	Rounsville	(118)	1
	809-110	Economics	Van Gordon <sup>5</sup>	(2375)	S
•	106-131	Typing I	$Dow^2$ , Hanson <sup>1</sup> , Briggs <sup>1</sup>	(212 <sup>4</sup> )	4
	102-160	Business Law	${\tt Tremain}^3$	$(227^1, 229^1, 213^1)$	3
	104-125	Elective Principle Insurance	E. Johnson	(111)	1
	Fall 1971				
	801-151	Comm. Skills I	${ m Klawiter}^3$ , ${ m Gregone}^3$ , Wahlstrom $^5$ , Barry $^4$ , Duerst $^2$	(220 <sup>5</sup> , 144 <sup>4</sup> , 111 <sup>3</sup> , 160 <sup>3</sup> , 114 <sup>1</sup> , 237 <sup>2</sup> , 226 <sup>2</sup> , 124 <sup>2</sup> )	21
•	005-143	Princ. of Agri-Mktg	Rounsville	(222)	1
18	005-151	Farm Equip. I	Kliner	(134, Ag. Lab)	г
22	809-151	Psychology of Human Rel.	Van Gordon <sup>3</sup> , Wahlstrom <sup>2</sup>	(237 <sup>3</sup> , 220 <sup>2</sup> )	5
	105-101	Business Math	Jetha <sup>3</sup> , Helgeson <sup>5</sup> , J. Severson <sup>1</sup> , Belay <sup>1</sup> , Braune <sup>4</sup>	(143 <sup>1</sup> , 134 <sup>4</sup> , 149 <sup>1</sup> , 233 <sup>8</sup> )	) 14
	****	**********************	***************************************	******************	******
	104-102	Credit Proc.	Rounsville <sup>2</sup>	(222 <sup>2</sup> )	2
	104-125	Princ. of Adv.	Becher <sup>2</sup>	$(111^1, 114^1)$	2
	104-119	Visual Merchandising	Becher <sup>2</sup>	(111 <sup>2</sup> )	2
	104-118	Layout & Lettering Techn.	Jankowski <sup>3</sup>	(114 <sup>3</sup> )	3
	809-153	American Institutions	D. Severson <sup>6</sup> , Stacy <sup>1</sup>	(228 <sup>6</sup> , 149 <sup>1</sup> )	7
	104-113	Elective Retailing	$Brown^2$	(215, 222)	2

1972
pring
ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

Course No.	Description	Teacher(s)	Room No. No.	of Sections
801-152	Comm. Skills II	Duerst $^{c}$ , Klawiter $^{3}$ , Wahlstrom $^{5}$	(226 <sup>4</sup> , 211 <sup>1</sup> , 237 <sup>1</sup> , 144 <sup>1</sup> , 220 <sup>5</sup> )	12
005-147	Inventory Control	Rounsville	(W103 <sup>2</sup> )	П
005-152	Farm Equipment II	Kliner <sup>l</sup>	(222)	1
105-137	Agri-Business Selling (Salesmanship 104-104)	M. Johnson <sup>2</sup>	(215, 111)	7
101-111	Acctg. I	$Devine^3$ , $Wendt^1$	(229 <sup>4</sup> )	4
*****	*****************	***************************************	*****************	***
005-141	Org. & Function of Agri-Business	Rounsville	(222)	1
011-60	Economics	Van Gordon <sup>6</sup>	(2376)	9
106-131	Typing I or II	Hanson <sup>1</sup> , Olson <sup>2</sup>	(212 <sup>3</sup> )	ю
102-160	Business Law	Rice, Tremain	$(203^2, 213^2)$	4
104-142	Elective	E. Johnson (Prin. Insurance)	(111)	П
Fall 1972				
104-162	Credit Proc.	Rounsville <sup>2</sup>	(201, 215)	2
104-125	Principles of Adv.	Becher	(114 <sup>3</sup> )	ო -
104-119	Visual Merchd.	Becher	(111)	Н
104-118	Layout & Lettering Tech.	Jankowski	(116-118)	П
809-153	Am. Instit.	${\tt Hegland}^2$ , Wahlstrom $^3$ , D. ${\tt Severson}^4$ , ${\tt Mattoon}^3$	$(135^1, 201^3, 230^2, 235^2, 228^4, 134^1, W103^1, 144)$	13
104-113	Elective Retailing	Brown	(215 <sup>2</sup> )	2

19
ng
rir
() H
ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

pring 1973				
Course No.	Description	Teacher(s)	ROOM NO.	No. of Section
005-141	Organization & Function of Agri-Business	Rounsville <sup>l</sup>	(215 <sup>1</sup> )	1
809-110	Economics 8 sections	Hegland $^6$ , Van Gordon $^2$	(201, 220, 230, 213, 237 <sup>2</sup> , 233 <sup>2</sup> , 226)	ω
106-131	Typing	$\operatorname{Gravunder}^2$ , $\operatorname{Carroll}^5$ , $\operatorname{Sequin}^1$	(212 <sup>8</sup> )	ω
102-160	Business Law	Tremain	$(213^2, 227^1)$	м
104-192	Elective Princip. Insurance	E. Johnson	(114 <sup>2</sup> )	2

ı	
ŀ	
,	n
1	
ŧ	,
U	ŋ
OU LEUVE JE	`
١,	٤.
ŀ	,
ı	
۰	4
١,	÷
"	2
ķ	-
1	`
Ľ	1
Ĺ	:
۰	•
τ	١.
ŀ	4
:	•
1	4
μ	J
ŀ	n
Ľ	4
ľ	•
ŀ	1
ı	

1969	
Fall	
	rg.

-		. = Total	\$ 697.29	631.44	1627.00	464.18	2251.07	686.35	\$6357.33 193	= WA 32.94	\$1564.39	\$1564.39 16 = WA 97.77	\$870.95	\$870.95 14 = WA 62.21	\$1980.38	\$2957.99 65 = WA 45.51
		x No. of Sec	Н	<b>г</b> -і	2	Н	m	ч			1		Т		1	
		x Fringe Benefits	\$1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12			\$1.12		\$1.12	·	\$1.12 1.12	
		Course Salary	\$622.58	563.79	726.34	414,45	96.699	612.81			\$1396.78		\$777.63		\$884.10 872.87	
,		Enrollment	21	20	44	26	62	20	193		16	16	1,4	14	42 23	65
COSCS		Teachers	五五	II	MM	D	BB	M			DD	, ,	<b>A</b>		LL D	
Instructional costs	ERIC 1969	Course No.	801-151		•						005-143		, 005–151	25	809-151	

= Total	\$ 4888.06 2403.71 1028.43 1405.88 2461.13	\$12,187.66 254 WA 47.98	\$3391.00 145 = WA 23.39
Course Salary x Fringe Benefits x No. of Sec.	ппппп	M = 4	. 4
Fringe Benefit	\$1.12 1.12 1.12 1.12 1.12	د. در اغ	1.12
Course Salary	\$1454.78 715.39 918.24 1255.25 732.48	ος Ο Γ	458.82
	•.		
Enrollment	72 73 12 25 72	254	81 145
Teachers	D T AA HH	>	E EI
Course No.	105-101	001-301	

i	
1	
S	
ت	
S.	
oʻ	
μ	
١.	
Ľ	
2	
R	
Ħ	
Ü	
U	
ğ	
н	
ĭ	
2	
Ħ	
Γ	

		- Total	\$4067.50 1173.30 3001.42	\$8242.22 227 = WA 36.31	\$1173.30	\$1173.30 18 = WA 65.18	\$870.95	\$870.95 15 = WA 58.06	\$1564.00	\$1564.00 27 = WA 57.94	\$425 <b>6.3</b> 5 801.24	\$5057.59 72 = WA 70.24
		ts x No. of Sec.	1 7 4		ı		П		Ч			
		Course Salary x Fringe Benefits	\$1.12		\$1.12		\$1.12		\$1.12	<i>:</i>	\$1.12	
		Course Salary	\$ 726.34 1047.59 669.96	· .	\$1047.59		\$777.63		\$1396.78		\$1266.72	
		Enrollment	114 21 92	227	18	18	, 15	15	27	27	67	72
0. 0. 0.		Teacher	MM Z BB		DD		٥	<b>~</b> 1.				
	Spring 1970	Course No.	801-152		005-147		005-152	12	005-137		101-111	·

l	
ľ	
$\mathbf{c}$	
2	
ŏ	
ŭ	
Ì.	
H	
euo	
õ	
널	
ĸ	
Inc	
И	
ننا	
2	
IJ	
ľ	

		c. = Total	\$2159.32	3542,65	2215.04	1688.20	542.73	\$9147.94 269 = WA 34.01	\$1395.96	\$1395.96 20 = WA 69.00	\$932.63	\$932.63 20 = WA 46.63	\$ 894.70 958.83	\$1853.52 87 = WA 21.30
		ts x No. of Sec.	ю	m	m	2			Н		. <b>-</b>		1 2	
	Adjusted	x Fringe Benefits	\$1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15		\$1.15		\$1.15		\$1.15 1.15	
		Course Salary	\$625.89	737.00	642.04	734.00	471.94		\$1213.88		\$810.98		\$ 778.00 1833.76	
		Enrollment	72	70	63	42	22	269	20	. 50	. 50	20	29	6.7
costs		Teacher	×	Z	Ą	BB	n	·	QQ		>		MM GG	
Instructional costs	<u>Seall 1970</u>	Course No.	801-151						005-143		005-151	128	809-151	

18.00

Sec. = Total	\$2512.74	\$2512.74 60 = WA 41.87	\$841.80	\$841.80 35 = WA 24.05	\$1632.20	\$1632.20 38 = WA 42.95	\$ 986.24 3042.51 1022.75	\$50 <b>51.</b> 51 53 = WA 95.31	\$544.70	\$544.70 26 = WA 20.95	\$1142.54	\$1142.54 26 = WA 43.94
No. of S	т		7		7		н н н		Н		H	
Adjusted ringe Benefits x	\$1.15		\$1.15		\$1.15		\$1.15 1.15 1.15		\$1.15		\$1.15	
Adjusted Course Salary x Fringe Benefits	\$728.33		\$366.00		\$709.65		\$ 857.60 2645.66 889.35		\$473.65		\$993.51	
Enrollment	09	09	35	35	38	38	25 13 <u>15</u>	53	26	<b>56</b>	26	26.
Teachers	da .		Oł		Ф		LL JJ GG	· .	ល		щ	
Course No.	104-102	- 1724	104-118		104-119		809-153 <b>05</b> 7		104-113		104-125	

	Sec. = Total	\$7118.04	1599.74	1438,74	1831.74	2691.00	\$14,679.26	289 WA 50.78	\$1116.65	\$1116.65	= WA 79.76	\$932.63	\$932.63 19	= WA 49.09	\$1116.65	\$1116.65	= WA 79.76	\$2433.26	\$2433.26	= WA 53.85	\$1395.97	\$1395.97	= WA 99.71
	No. of Sec	9	2	2	ю	m		11	<b>ન</b> .			Н			ч		п	7		11	ч		"
Adjusted	Course Salary x Fringe Benefits x	\$1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15			\$1.15			\$1.15			\$1.15			\$1.15			\$1.15		
	Course Salary	\$1031.65	695.54	625.89	530.94	780.00			\$971.10			\$810.98			\$971.10			\$1053.62			\$1213.89		
	Enrollment	105	35	44	51	54	289		1.5	14		19	19		14	14		45	45		14	14	
	Teachers	NN	. A	×	Ω	×			QQ			Λ			DD			H			ОО		
	Course No.	801-152							005-147			005-152	·	1.	005-137			101-111			005-141		

								*	
c. = Total	\$4321.30	\$4321,30 100 = WA 43.21	\$2530.00 913.82 1155.18	\$4599.00 88 = WA 52.26	\$3718.86	\$3718.86 80 = WA 46.49	\$544.69	\$544.69 32. = WA 24.21	
x No. of Sec. = Total	Ŋ		. 17 5		ю		П		
Adjusted Course Salary x Fringe Benefits x	\$1.15		\$1.15 1.15 1.15		\$1.15		\$1.15		
Course Salary	\$751.53		\$1100.00 794.63 1004.50		\$1077.93		\$473.65		
Enrollment	100	100	60 15 <u>13</u>	88	80	08	32	32	
Teachers	LL	· 	ŊΖĿ		KK		w		•
Conres No.	809-110		106-131		102-160		104-125	1.	32

Total	\$2197.63	1342.33	1789.78	1747.39	5067.92	1514.77	2772.46	\$16,432.29 436	37.69	\$1326.17	\$1326.17	WA 57.66	\$1017.81	\$1017.81	WA 44.25	\$3489.13	\$5516 122	WA 45.22
No. of Sec. =	m	Э	4	2	5	H	к	O.	= WA	Н.		;s 	н.		; <u>s</u>	г 7		<u>is</u>
Adjusted Course Salary x Fringe Benefits x	\$1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1,18	1.18			\$1.18			\$1.18			\$1.18 1.18	, et	
Course Salary	\$ 620.80	379.19	379.19	740.42	858.97	1283.70	783.16			\$1123.87			\$862.55			\$985.63 858.97		
Enrollment	55	09	97	34	104	21	65	436		23	23		23	23		77	122	
Teachers	D	ᄓ	Æ	<b>X</b>	MM	BB	W			DD			۸			LL MM		
Course No.	801-151									005-143			.005-151	1	<b>L33</b>	809-151		

No. of Sec. = Total	3 \$3719.34 5 5887.14		1730	4 5561.01	\$22,147.51	= WACE 67.11	2 \$1989.27	\$1989.27 51 = WACE 37.53	2 \$2385.49	\$2385.49 51 = WACE 46.77	2 \$1908.39	\$1908.39 32 = WACE 59.64	3 \$2366.03	\$2366.03 51 = WACE 46.39
Adjusted  X Fringe Benefits X	\$1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18			\$1.18		\$1.18		\$1.18	•	\$1.18	
Course Salary x	\$1050,66	4448.89	1466.38	1178.17			\$842.91		\$1010.80		\$808.64		\$668.37	
Enrollment	74	18	24	91	330		53	23	51	51	32	. 32	51	51
Teachers	αщ	HH	U	ជ	<b>.</b>		DD		, M		Д		Q	
Course No.	105-101						104-162		104-125	134	104-119		104-118	

Course No.	Teachers	Enrollment	Course Salary x	Adjusted Course Salary x Fringe Benefits x No. of Sec. = Total	X :No. of Sec	= Total
309-153	Q 99	18 128	\$6932.89 844.83	\$1.18	L 9	\$8180.81
		146			: = WACE	\$14,162.21 146 CE 97.00
104-113	U	40	\$488.44	\$1.18	7	\$1152.72
		40	s.,		II	\$1152.72 40 = WACE 28.82

	= Total	\$4368.49	2197.63	3040.75	\$9606.87 237	40.54	\$1325.81	\$1325.81	48° TO	\$1017.82	\$1017.82	37.70	\$2490.06	\$2490.06 53	46.98	\$4210.97	\$5329.21 77	69.21	\$1657.71	\$1657.71 15 110.32
	No. of Sec. = I	ς.	m	m	<b>σ</b> ,	= WA	۲-1 ۱	5	₩ =	1	· σ	= WA	2	o,	= WA	e -1 e -1	<b>·</b>	= WA	1	\$ = WA
Adjusted	Fringe Benefits x	\$1.18	1.18	1.18			\$1.18			\$1.18			\$1.18			\$1.18 1.18			\$1.18	
	Course Salary x	\$740.42	620.80	858.97			\$1123.87			\$862.56			\$1055.11			\$1189.54 947.66			\$1404.84	
	Enrollment	87	55	95	237		27	27		27	27			53		62	77		15	15
	Teachers	M	D	MM			DD			Λ			E			н 8			ОД	
	Course No.	801-152				·	005-147			005-152		Į 36	104-104			101-111			005-141	

			•					
= Total	\$6978.24	\$6978.24 151 =. WA 46.21	\$4808.77	\$6693.96 59 = WA 113.46	\$ 980.91	\$5025.78 112 = WA 44.87	\$2289.84	28 = WA 81.78
No. of Sec. = Total	ø	II	1 2	11	3 1	11		11
Course Salary x Fringe Benefits x	\$1.18		\$1.18 1.18		\$1.18 1.18		\$1.18	
Course Salary	\$985.63		\$4075.19 798.83		\$ 831.28 1142.62		\$1940.54	
Enrollment	151	151	27	59	29	112	28 28	
Teachers	LL		N AA		CC KK		w 	
Course No.	809-110		106-131		102-160		104-192 7	

, -		\$2143.73	\$2143.73 50 = WA 42.87	\$4254.12	\$4254.12 79 = WA 53.85	\$1134.41	\$1134.41 15 = WA 75.63	\$1160.41	\$1160.41 30 = WA 38.68	\$1539.38 3073.72 3823.78 2071.15	\$10,508.03 262 = WA 40.11	\$1529.66	\$1529.66 45 = WA 33.99
	X No. of	7	·	м		Н		ч		3 4 3 2		2	
Adjusted	Salary x Fringe Benefits	\$1.20		\$1.20	,	\$1.20		\$1.20		\$1.20 1.20 1.20 1.20		\$1.20	
	Course Salary	\$893.22		\$1181.70		\$945.34		\$967.01		\$641.41 853.01 796.62 575.32	.7%	\$637.36	
	Enrollment	20	50	79	79	15		30	30	52 67 74 69	262	45	45
	Teachers	ОО		Ф		д		Q		O MM GG		Ü	
Gall.	Course No.	104-162		104-125		104-119	1.5	<b>8</b> 104-118		809-153		104-113	

420ء	1	
בייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייי	מול לו	

\$3195.00 89 4 35.90 \$6700.32 196 A 34.19 \$7283.49 290 \$1231.51 59 A 20.87 \$1786.43 17 \$4618.08 2082.24 105.08 \$2027.62 4110.66 \$3195.00 \$1786.43 1145.21 \$1231.51 Adjusted
Course Salary x Fringe Benefits x No. of Sec. = Total = WA = WA = WA = WA 9 7 m 2 \$1.20 1.20 1.20 \$1.20 \$1.20 \$1.20 \$1.20 \$641.40 867.60 \$844.84 685.11 954.34 \$513,13 \$1488.69 \$887.50 Enrollment 146 196 84 166 40 290 89 59 59 17 89 Teachers 0 1 g 젔 တ Course No. 809-110 104-192 005-141 106-131

# 1970-1971

## Instructional Costs

Course No.	Cost Dar Enrollast v	lst Semester Rank Number of Enrollees in	nari - Compator Motala
Course No.	Cost Per Emioriee. X	Mumber or Emorrees In	Agri - Semester Totals
801-151	\$ 34.01	19	\$ 646.19
005-143	69.70	19	1324.30
005–151	46.63	19	885.97
809-151	21.30	19	404.70
105-101	62.03	19	1178.57
106-180	18.00	<u>19</u>	342.00
	\$251.67	19	\$4781.73

# \*Weighted Average Cost

Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee*	3rd Semester Ra K Number of Enrollees	nk in Agri = Semester Totals
104-162	\$ 41.87	11	\$ 460.57
104-118	24.05	11	264.55
104-119	42.05	11	472.45
809-153	95.31	11	1048.41
104-113	20.95	11	230.45
104-125	43.94	<u>11</u> (	483.34
	\$269.01	11	\$2959.88



1970-1971 Instructional Costs

		2nd Semester Rank	,
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee* x	Number of Enrollees in Ag	ri = Semester Totals
801-152	\$ 50.78	17	\$ 863.26
005-147	79.76	17	1355.92
005-152	49.00	17	834.53
005-137	79.76	17	1355.92
101-111	53.85	<u>17</u>	915.45
	\$313.24	17	\$5325.08
		Ath Comaghan Dank	
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee* x	4th Semester Rank Number of Enrollees in Ag	ri - Semester Totals
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee* x \$ 99.71		ri - Semester Totals \$ 997.10
		Number of Enrollees in Ag	
005-141	\$ 99.71	Number of Enrollees in Ag	\$ 997.10
005-141 809-110	\$ 99.71 43.21	Number of Enrollees in Ag	\$ 997.10 432.10
005-141 809-110 106-130	\$ 99.71 43.21 52.26	Number of Enrollees in Ag  10  10  10	\$ 997.10 432.10 522.60

<sup>\*</sup>Weighted Average Cost



Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee x N	lst Semester Rank Number of Enrollees in Ag	ri = Semester Totals
801 <b>-</b> 15 <b>1</b>	\$ 37.69	25	\$ 942.25
005-143	57.66	25	1441.50
005 <b>-</b> 151	44.25	25	1106.25
809 <b>-</b> 151	45.22	25	1130.50
105-101	67.11	<u>25</u>	1677.75
	\$251.93	25	\$6928.25
		3rd Semester Rank	
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee x N	number of Enrollees in Ag	ri = Semester Totals
104-162	\$ 37.53	10	\$ 375.30
104-125	46.77	10	467.70
104-119	59.64	10	596.40
104-118	46.39	10	463.90
809-153	97.00	10	970.00
104-113	28.82	10	288.20
	\$316.15	10	\$3161.50
Spring 1972			
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee x N	2nd Semester Rank Tumber of Enrollees in Ag	ri = Semester Toțals
801-152	\$ 40.54	21	\$ 851.34
005-147	49.10	21	1031.10
005-152	37.70	21	791.70
104-104	46.98	21	986.58
101-111	69.21	<u>21</u>	1453.41
	\$243.53	. 21	\$5114.13



		4th Semester Rank	
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee X 1	Number of Enrollees in Agri	= Semester Totals
005-141	\$110.22	8	\$ 881.76
809-110	46.21	8	369.68
106-131	113.46	8	907.68
102-160	44.87	8	358.96
104-192	81.78	<u>8</u>	654.24
	\$396.54	8	\$3172.32
, som			
Fall 1972		,	
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee x	3rd Semester Rank Number of Enrollees in Agri	i = Semester Totals
104-162	\$ 42.87	12	\$ 514.44
104-125	53.85	12	646.20
104-119	75.63	12	907.56
104-118	38.68	12	464.16
809-153	40.11	12	481.32
104-113	33.94	12	407.28
	\$217.20	12	\$2606.40
Spring 1973		,	
Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee x	4th Semester Rank Number of Enrollees in Agr	i = Semester Totals
005-141	\$105.08	12	\$1260.96
809-110	34.19	12	410.28
106-131	25.12	12	301.44
102-160	35.90	12	430.80
104-192	20.87	<u>12</u>	250.44
	\$221.16	12	\$2653.92

Instructional Equipment Depreciation Schedule by courses required of Agri-Business Program Enrollees for the years 1969-1973 (assuming cost of equipment on hand per room, 6/30/74 was the same during each period).

Fall 1969

Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee	x No. of 1st Sem. Enrollees	Semester Totals
801-151	<b>.</b> 29	. 13	3.77
005-143	.04	13	.52
005-151	.06	13	<b>.</b> 78
809-151	.04	13	.52
105-101	. 08	13	1.04
106-180	.01	<u>13</u>	13
	.52	13	6.76
Spring 1970	·	•	
apring 1970	<u>5</u>		
		No. of 2nd Sem. Enrollees	
801 <b>-</b> 152	.31	13	.40
005-147	3.58	13	46.54
005-152	4.30	13	55.96
005-137	. 02	13	. 26
101-111	.58	<u>13</u>	7.54
	8.79	13	114.27
Fall 1970			
		No. of 1st Sem. Enrollees	
801-151	.17	19	3.23
005-143	. 07	19	1.33
809-151	.01	19	119
005-101	6.45	19	122.55
106-180	.01	19	.19
105-101	.08	<u>19</u>	1.52
	6.79	19	129.01
		144	



Fall 1971			
Course No.		No. of 1st Sem. Enrollees	= Semester Totals
801-151	• 59	. 25	14.75
005-143	5.91	25	147.75
005-151	13.79	25	344.75
809-151	.16	25	4.00

2.17

22.62

105-101

Spring 1972

54.25

565.50

Fall 1971			
		No. of 3rd Sem. Enrollees	
104-162	3.40	10	34.00
104-125	.05	10	.50
104-118	.07	10	.70
809-153	.05	10	<b>.</b> 50
104-113	.83	10	8.30
104-119	.06	10	.60
	4.46	10	44.60

25

25

		No. of 2nd Sem. Enro	ollees
801-152	.48	21	10.08
005-147	.05	. 21	1.05
005-152	10.50	21	220.50
104-104	.05	21	1.05
101-111	. 56	21	<u>11.76</u>
	11.64	21	244.44



Fall 1970

Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee	No. of lst Sem. Enrollees	= Semester Totals
104-162	.15	11	1.65
104-118	.03	11	.33
104-119	.02	11	. 22
809-153	•33	11	3.63
104-113	.04	11	.44
104-125	.04	11	.44
	.61	11	6.71
Spring 1971	<u>-</u>	No. of 2nd Sem. Enrollees	
801-152	14.75	17	250.75
005-147	9.22	17	156.66
005-137	.06	17	1.02
101-111	•35	17	5.95
005-152	9.22	<u>17</u>	156.66
	53.54	17	570.16
Fall 1971			
		No. of 4th Sem. Enrollees	
005-141	.10	10	1.00
809-110	.04	10	.40
106-130	12.59	10	125.40
102-160	.17	10	1.70
104-125	43	<u>10</u>	4.30
	13.28	10	132.80



Course No.	Cost Per Enrollee	x No. of 4th Sem. Enrollees	= Semester Totals
005-141	8.40	8	67.20
809-110	.02	8	.16
106-131	7.01	8	56.08
102-160	.13	8	1.04
104-192	11	<u>8</u>	.88
	15.67	8	125.36
Fall 1972			
		No. of 3rd Sem. Enrollee	2 <u>s</u>
104-102	.09	12	1.08
104-125	.07	12	.84
104-119	.11	12	1.32
104-118	.02	12	. 24
104-113	.06	12	.72
809-153	68	12	8.16
	1.03	12	12.36
Spring 197	<u>3</u>		
		No. of 4th Sem. Enrollee	<u>s</u>
005-141	.75	12	9.00
809-110	.14	12	1.68
106-131	3.80	12	45.60
102-160	.12	12	1.44
104-192	.62	12	7.44
	5.43	12	65.16



chedule of SPACE UTILIZATION by room by semester for the years 1969-1973.

(assuming 50 year Life)	Depreciation Cost Per Room	114.85 114.85 114.85 115.35 117.96 114.85 1139.23 127.29 145.81	114.85 114.65 145.81	555.91 112.59 140.79 130.41 140.79	115.77 115.57 104.60 146.98 115.77 115.77 115.77 115.77	555.91 151.33 115.06
14	x Total Bldg. Depr. =	38,892.20	38,892.20	1,236.00	39,204.25	1,236.00 39,204.25
	Sq. Ft./Total Sq. Ft. %	. 2953% . 2948% . 2966% . 2968% . 2953% . 2948% . 3749%	.2953% .2948% .3749%	44.9769% .2895% .3620% .3353% .2948%	. 2953% . 2948% . 2668% . 2953% . 2948% . 2953% . 4020%	44.9769% .3086% .2935%
	Total Sq. Ft.	224,868	224,868	6,490	224,868	6,490 224,868
	Sq. Ft.	664 663 663 667 651 682 664 663 805 736 843	664 663 843	0	664 663 663 664 664 664	2919 694 660
Fall 1969	Room No.	226 235 220 233 116 118 237 213 213 215 215 211	226 220 211	Ag. Bldg. 116 227 229 8 203 213 Fall 1970	235 220 124 211 226 213 237 230	Ag. Lab 228 129

(assuming 50 year Life)	Depreciation Cost Per Room	140.35	116.28 128.32	113.90		115.57	115.77	146.98	157.60	113.50	94.33	555.91	113.65	157.60	131.43	118.91 15.77	//•CCT	14/.14	/C.CII	141.92		87 911	100.52	158 84	132.68	141.46	116.68	116.68	105.42	158.84	125.10	116.68	96.65	81.20	67.77	n (	129.32
(Semester ie ½ yr)	x Total Bldg. Depr. =	39,204.25				39,204.25						1,236.00	39,204.25					•				02 012 06	00.1010														
	Sq. Ft./Total Sq. Ft. % >	.3580%	.2966%	.2895%		.2948%	. 2953%	. 2353% 3749%	4020%	. 2895%	. 2406%	44.9769%	. 2899%	.4020%	, 33538 , 33538	3033%	. 2953%	.3753%	. 2948%	.3620%		0000	*OFC2.	% ##67.	3.3.5.8 %83.5.8 %83.5.8	.3580%	. 2953%	. 2953%	.2668%	.4020%	.3166%	. 2953%	. 2446%	.2055%	. 2966%	.3086%	.32738
	Total Sq. Ft.	224,868				224,868		.e. 3				6,490	224,686		•••							000 700	000 1 777													٠	
1970 (cont.)	Sq. Ft.	805 682	667 736	651	71	663	664	664 873	904	651	541	2919	652	904	754	682	664	844	663	814	.1	0	573	7 700	ን ር ተ	805	664	664	009	904	712	664	550	462	299	694	736
11	ON EO ON	114	233 215	116	Spring 1971	220	230	235	222	116	1454	Ag. Lab	135	111	229	118		215			Fall 1971	C	022 VV L	***	16.1	114	237	226	124	222	134	237	143	149	233	228	215

(assuming 50 year Life)	Depreciation Cost Per Room	116.68 148.13 116.68	116.48 92.04 158.84 466.18 129.32 158.84 148.29 116.48	127.59 129.89 142.08 159.59 114.89 120.37 117.19 125.65	92.04 100.96 117.19 127.59 117.00 117.10 117.19 117.19
(Semester ie ½ yr)	11	39,512.50	1,236.00 39,512.50 1,236.00 39,512.50	39,686.23	1,236.00 39,686.23 39,686.23
	Sq. Ft./Total Sq. Ft. %	.2953% .3749% .2953% .2544%	.2948% 7.4422% .4020% .3273% .4020% .3353 .2948%	.3215% .3273% .4020% .2895% .3033% .2953% .3086%	7.4422% .2544% .2953% .3273% .2948% .2953% .2953%
	Total Sq. Ft.	224,868	6,490 224,868 6,490 224,868	224,868	6,490 224,868 224,868
972	Sq. Ft.	664 843 664 572	663 483 2436 736 754 844 663		483 572 664 736 723 663 664 664 667
ZZET BUILLE ER	M WO	226 211 237 144	220 W103 222 Ag. Lab 215 111 229 212 213	Fall 1972 201 215 114 111 116 116 228 228 134	W103 144 235 235 201 220 230 233 237 233 233 233 226

(assuming 50 year Life)	= Depreciation Cost Per Room	143.64 142.08 149.94
(Semester ie ½ yr)	Sq. Ft./Total Sq. Ft. % x Total Bldg. Depr. =	39,686.23
	Sq. Ft./Total Sq. Ft.	.3620% .3580% .3753%
	Total Sq. Ft.	224,868
1972 (cont.)	Sq. Ft.	81 <b>4</b> 805 8 <b>44</b>
or bring ER	OM Mo	227 11 <b>4</b> 212

Mr. Norbert Wurtzel, Assistant Director, Administrative Services, Area Vocational Technical & Adult Education District One; and Physical Facilities Inventory 1968 & 1971. Sources:

## Time Utilization Figures

Fall 1969

Course No.	. Room No.	Enrollment	Hours/Total Hours	No. of Sections	Time Utilization
801-151	220 235 220 233	16/26 3/26 6/23 18/24 193		4 1 2 4	.6154 .1154 .2609 .7500
005-143	116	16/16	5/26	1	.1923
005 <b>-</b> 1 <b>51</b>	118	14/14	3/24	1	.1250
809–151	237 235	65	6/23 4/26	2	.2609 .1538
105-101	235 213 114 215	254	15/26 25/33 5/39 10/20	3 6 1 1	.5769 .7576 .1563 .5000
106-180	211 235	145	12/17 2/26	6 1	.7059 .0769
Spring 19	<u>70</u>				
801-152	226 220 211	227	25/33 10/25 10/23	4 8 2	.7576 .4000 .4348
005-147	New Bldg.	18/18	(Not Listed proba	ably ½) 1	. 2500
005-152	New Bldg. 116	15/15	(Not Listed proba	bly ½) l	.2500
005 <b>-</b> 1 <b>37</b>	116	27/27	3/20 (gues	s) 1	.1500
101-111	223 229 213	72	10/30 (gues 5/40 5/10	2 1 1	.3333 .1250 .5000



## Time Utilization Figures

### Fall 1970

Course No.	Room No.	Enrollment	Hours/Total Hours	No. of Sections	Time Utilization
801-151	235		3/28	1	.1071
	220		3/25	1	.1200
	124		3/27		
				1	.1111
	211		3/28	1	.1071
	226		28/38	5	<b>.</b> 73 <b>6</b> 8
	213		8/23	2	.3478
	237		5/28	1	.1786
	230		3/26	1	.1154
		269	3, 20	1	• TT24
005-143	114	20/20	5/29	1	.1724
005-151	New Shop	20/20		1	12
809-151	237		3/28	1	.1071
	228		6/22	2	.2727
		87	0, 22	2	• 2 / 2 /
005-101	235		5/28	1	.1786
	129		5/34	1	.1471
	111		<b>5/2</b> 9	1	.1724
	114 .		5/32	1	.1563
	118		5/31	1	.1613
	233				
			15/38	3	.3947
	215		5/8	1	.6250
	230		5/26	1	.1923
	237		5/28	1	.1786
	116	280	5/22	1	. 2273
106-180	211	158	16/28	7	.5714
Fall 1970					
104-162	118		6/31	2	.1935
	124		2/27	1	.0741
		60	2, 2,	1	.0/41
104-118	114	35/35	4/32	2	.1250
104-119	114	38/38	4/32	2	.1250
809-153	220		1/25	1	.0400
	228		1/22	1.	.0455
	124	53	3/27	1	.1111
104-113	114	26/26	5/32	1	.1563
104-125	114	26/26	5/32	1	.1563



Fall 1971

Segment I

					•
Course No.	Room No.	Enrollment	Hours/Total Hours	No. of Sections	Time Utilization
801-151	220		15/24	5	.6250
	144		11/30	4	.3667
	111		11/34		.3235
				3	
	160		8/35	3	.2286
	114		3/30	1	.1000
	237		15/34	3	.4412
	226		9/35	2	.2571
	124		3/32	2	.0938
		436	·		
	•	e ,			
005-143	222	23/23	4/26	1	.1739
005-151	134	23/23	1/37	1	.0270
	Ag. Lab	23/23	4/4	1	1.0000
	mg. Dab	20, 20	3/ 3	<b>±</b>	1.0000
809-151	237		9/35	3	.2571
	220		3/24	2	.1250
		122	5, 21	_	72250
		122		•	
105-101	143		5/35	1	.1429
	134		15/37	4	.4054
	139		5/24	1	.2083
	233	220	25/36	8	.6944
		330			
Fall 1971			Segment II		
<del></del>			-		
104-162	222	53	6/26	2	.2308
104-125	111		5/34	1	.1471
	114		5/30	1	.1667
		51			
104-118	114	•	4/30	3	.1333
		15			
000 150	0.00		20.400	_	
809-153	228	9	18/29	6	.6207
	149		1/23	1	.0435
		122			
104 112	216		4 /22	•	7.000
104-113	215		4/31	1	.1290
	222		4/26		.1538
		146	·		
104				_	
104-119	111		4/34	1	.1176
		15			



Segment I

Course No.	Room No.	Enrollment	Hours/Total Hours	No. of Sections	Time Utilization
801-152	220		3/24	1	.1250
	230		12/24	4	.5000
	235		21/21	7	1.0000
	211		3/3	1	1.0000
	222		6/25	. 2	.2400
*,	116		3/26	1	.1154
·	145 <del>½</del>		3/3	1	1.0000
,		289			
005-147	Ag. Lab	14/14	اخ (guess)	1	.5000
005-152	M-135	19/19	ر (guess)	1	.5000
	Ag. Lab	19/19	ኔ (guess)	1	• 5000
005-137	116		5/26	1	.1923
	111	34	5/29	1	.1724
801-111	229	45/45		2	•5360
Spring 197	<u>71</u>	•	Segment II		
005-141	118	14/14	5/18	1	.2778
809-110	237	100/100	15/18	5	.8333
10 <b>6-</b> 130	212	88/88		4	1.0000
102-160	213			1	.4000
	227			1	.1070
	229	80	•	1	.0810
104-125	111	32/32	5/29	1	.1724



Course No.	Room No.	Enrollment	Hours/Total Hours	No. of Sections	Time Utilization
801 <del>-</del> 152	226 211 237 144 220		14/29 3/25 4/23 3/28 12/28	4 1 1 1 5	.4827 .1200 .1739 .1071 .4285
005 <b>-</b> 147	W103	237 27/27	4/28	1	.1428
005 <b>-15</b> 2	222 Ag. Lab	27/27	1/31 4/4	. 1 1	.0322 1.0000
104 <b>-</b> 104 005 <b>-</b> 137	215 111	53	4/27 4/34	, 1 , 1	.1481 .1176
801-111	229	77/77	20/29	4	. 6896
Spring 19	<u>972</u>			4th Se	emester Rank
005-141	222	15/15	5/31	1	.1613
809 <del>-</del> 110	237	15 <b>1/</b> 151	18/23	6	.5806
106-131	212	5 <b>9/</b> 59	15/40	3	.3750
1 <b>0</b> 2 <b>-</b> 160	203 213	112	6/35 6/24	2 2	.1579 .2500
104-192	111	28/28	15/38	1	.3947
Spring 19	972			3rd Se	emester Rank
104-162	201 215	50	3/33 3/37	1 1	.0909 .0811
104-125	114	79/79	15/30	3	.5000
104-119	. 111	15/15	6/28	1	.2143
104-118	116 118	30	4/37 2/38	1.	.1081 .0526



#### Time Utilization Figures

## Spring 1973 (cont.)

Course No.	Room No.	Enrollment	Hours/Total Hours	No. of Sections	Time Utilization
809-153	135		2/34	1	.0588
	201		. 7/33	3	.2121
	230		4/38	2	.1053
	235		5/36	2	.1389
	228		12/40	4	.3000
	134		3/38	1	.0789
	W103		4/24	· <u>1</u>	.1667
	144		2/27	1	.0741
		262			
104-113	215	45/45	8/37	2	.2162
Spring 197	3_	•			
00 <b>5-</b> 141	215	17/17	3/22	1	.1389
809-110	201		3/33	1	.0909
	220		3/28	1	.1071
	230		1/34	1	.0294
	213		1/3	1	.3333
•	237		6/30	2	.2000
	233	***	6/32	2	.1875
rate is all the	226	196	2/29	1	.0690
106-131	212	290	1/1	8	1.0000
104-192	114	59/59	½ (guess)	2	.5000
102-160	213		2/3 (guess)	2	.6067
	227	89	3/38	1	.0789



Instructional Rooms

Building Depreciation Costs Per Course by semester for Agri-Business Enrollees for years 1969-1973.

Fall 1969

Course No.	Total Cost	Cost Per Enrollee	x Number Agri-Business E	nrollees = Total
801-151	\$200.35	\$1.04	13	\$13.52
005-143	21.65	1.35	13	17.55
005-151	14.75	1.05	13	13.65
809-151	47.62	.73	13	9.49
105-101	238.53	.94	13	12.22
106~180	111.76	.77	13	10.01
				\$76.44
Ci 107	0	٠.		·
Spring 197	<u>u</u>			
801-152	\$ 63.40	\$ .87	13	\$ 11.31
005-147	142.02	7 <b>.8</b> 9	13	102.57
005-152	142.02	9.47	13 .	123.11
005-137	28.15	1.04	13	13.52
101-111	120.56	1.67	13	21.71
				\$272.22
Fall 1970	(1st Segment)			
801-151	\$213.16	\$ .79	19	\$ 15.01
005-143	27.17	1.40	19	26.60
005-151	284.10	14.21	19	269.99
809-151	53.67	. 62	19	11.78
105-101	300.74	1.07	19	20.33
106-180	83.98	.53	19	10.07
				\$353.78



Fall	1970	(2nd	Segment)	

Course No.	Total Cost	Cost Per Enrollee	x Number Agri-Business E	nrollees = Total
104-162	\$ 30.76	\$ .51	11	<b>\$</b> 5.61
104-118	17.54	.50	. 11	5.50
104-119	17.54	.46	11	5.06
809-153	23.13	. 44	. 11	4.84
104-113	21.94	.84	, 11 <sub>9</sub>	9.24
104-125	21.94	.84	11	9.24
				\$39.49
Spring 197	<u>l</u> (lst Segmen	t)		
801-152	\$480.33	\$ 1.66	17	\$.28.22
005-147	232.09	16.58	17	281.86
005-152	243.45	12.81	17	217.77
005-137	49.00	1.44	17	24.48
101-111	70.46	1.57	17	26.69
				\$579.02
Spring 197	<u>l</u> (2nd Segmen	t)		
005-141	\$ 33.03	\$2.36	10	\$23.60
809-110	129.80	1.30	10	3.00
106-130	147.14	1.67	10	16.70
102-160	72.07	.90	10	9.00
104-125	27.17	.85	10,	8.50
		and the second s		\$70.80



Instructional Rooms

Building Depreciation Costs Per Course by semester for Agri-Business Enrollees for the years 1969-1973.

Fall 1971 (1st Segment)

Course No.	Total Cost	Cost Per Errollee	x Number Agri-Business Enro	llees = Total
801-151	\$295.99	\$ .68	25	\$ 17.00
005-143	27.62	1.20	25	30.00
005-151	467.50	20.33	25	508.25
809-151	44.56	. 37	25	9.25
105-101	62.82	.49	25	12.25
				\$576.75
mall 1971	(2nd Segment)			
<u>Fall</u> 19/1	(2nd Segment)			•
104-162	\$36.66	\$ .67	10	\$ 6.70
104-125	46.95	.92	10	9.20
104-118	18.86	1.26	10	12.60
809-153	79.22	.65	. 10	6.50
104-113	41.11	• 28	10	2.80
104-119	18.68	1.25	10	12.50
		•		\$50.30
Spring 197	'2 (1st Segment	:)		
801-152	\$155.07	\$ .65	21	\$ 13.65
005-147	13.14	.49	21	10.29
005-152	469.30	17.38	21	364.98
104-104	38.20	.72	21	15.12
101-111	91.37	1.19	21	24.99
				\$429.03



131.95

Course No.	Total Cost	Cost Per Enrollee	x Number of Agri-Business En	rollees = Total
005-141	\$25.63	\$1.71	8	\$13.60
809-110	67.74	.45	8	3.60
106-131	55.61	.94	8	7.53
102-160	51.71	.46	8	3.68
104-192	62.64	2.24	8	17.92
				\$46.32
Fall 1972				
1411 1572				
104-162	\$ 22.13	\$ .44	12	\$ 5.28
104-125	71.04	.90	12	10.80
104-119	34.18	2.28	12	27.36
104-118	18.75	.63	12	7.56
809-153	131.92	.50	12	6.00
104-113	28.09	.62	12	7.44
				\$64.44
Spring 197	3			
005-141	\$ 18.03	\$1.06	12	\$12.72
809-110	120.09	.61	12	7:32
102-160	50.34	. 57	12	6.84
104-192	71.04	1.20	12	14.40
106-131	149.94	.51	12	6.12
	•			\$47.40

